arXiv:1210.2807v1 [math.DG] 10 Oct 2012

Quantization for an elliptic equation with critical exponential growth on compact Riemannian surface without boundary

Yunyan Yang

Department of Mathematics, Renmin University of China, Beijing 100872, P. R. China

---

Abstract

Let (Σ, g) be a compact Riemannian surface without boundary. We consider a sequence of nonnegative solutions u_k to the equation $\Delta_g u_k + \tau_k u_k = f_k(x, u_k)$ on Σ, where Δ_g is the Laplace-Beltrami operator, $\tau_k \to \tau_\infty > 0$ in $C^0(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$, $f_k(x,t)$ has critical exponential growth with respect to t, and $f_k \to f_\infty$ in $C^1_{\rm loc}(\Sigma \times \mathbb{R})$. Let $F_k(x,t) = \int_0^t f_k(x,t)dt$ and

$$J_k(u_k) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Sigma \left(|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2\right) dv_g - \int_\Sigma F_k(x, u_k) dv_g \to \beta$$

as $k \to \infty$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\beta = J_\infty(u_\infty) + 2\pi N$, where u_∞ is a weak limit of u_k in $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$, the usual Sobolev space. If $N = 0$, the convergence of u_k to u_∞ is strong in $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$.

Key words: Quantization, Multi-bubble analysis, exponential growth
2010 MSC: 58J05

---

1. Introduction

Let (Σ, g) be a compact Riemannian surface without boundary, $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ be the usual Sobolev space, namely the completion of $C^\infty(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ under the norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,2}(\Sigma,\mathbb{R})} = \left(\int_\Sigma \left(|\nabla_g u|^2 + u^2\right) dv_g\right)^{1/2},$$

where $\nabla_g u$ denotes the gradient of u and dv_g denotes the volume element with respect to the Riemannian metric g. Let $f_k : \Sigma \times [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a sequence of functions satisfying the following hypotheses:

(H1) $f_k(x, 0) = 0$, and $f_k(x,t) > 0$ for all k, all $x \in \Sigma$, and all $t > 0$;
(H2) $f_k \in C^2(\Sigma \times [0, +\infty))$ for each k and $f_k \to f_\infty$ in $C^1_{\rm loc}(\Sigma \times [0, +\infty))$ as $k \to \infty$;
(H3) for any $\nu > 0$, there exists a constant $C_\nu > 0$ such that for all k, all $x \in \Sigma$, and all $t > 0$,

$$F_k(x,t) \le \nu t f_k(x,t) + C_\nu,$$

Email address: `yunyanyang@ruc.edu.cn` (Yunyan Yang)

where

$$F_k(x,t)=\int_0^t f_k(x,s)ds$$

is the primitive of $f_k(x,t)$;
(H4) $f_k'(x,t)/(tf_k(x,t))\to 2$ as $t\to+\infty$ uniformly in $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and in $x\in\Sigma$, where f_k' is the derivative of f_k with respect to t, moreover there exists a constant C such that $|\nabla_g f_k(x,t)|\leq C(1+f_k(x,t))$ for all $(x,t)\in\Sigma\times\mathbb{R}$;
(H5) there exist ψ, a continuous function with $\psi(0)=0$, $t_0>0$, and $k_0>0$, such that

$$|f_k(x,t)/f_k(y,t)-1|\leq\psi(d_g(x,y))$$

for all $t\geq t_0$, all $k>k_0$, and all $x,y\in\Sigma$, where $d_g(\cdot,\cdot)$ denotes the geodesic distance between two points of Σ.

By (H4) we have $f_k(x,t)=f_k(x,t_0)e^{(1+o(1))(t^2-t_0^2)}$ for any given $t_0>0$, where $o(1)\to 0$ as $t\to\infty$ uniformly in $x\in\Sigma$. In view of the Trudinger-Moser embedding [7, 11, 12, 14], we say that $f_k(x,t)$ is of critical exponential growth with respect to t. A typical example satisfying (H1)-(H5) is

$$f_k(x,t)=\lambda_k te^{t^2}, \tag{1.1}$$

where λ_k is a sequence of positive real numbers such that $\lambda_k\to\lambda_\infty$ as $k\to\infty$. Suppose that for each $k\in\mathbb{N}$ we have a smooth function $u_k\geq 0$ satisfying the equation

$$\Delta_g u_k+\tau_k u_k=f_k(x,u_k)\quad\text{in}\quad\Sigma, \tag{1.2}$$

where Δ_g is the Laplace-Beltrami operator, τ_k is a sequence of smooth functions such that

$$\tau_k\to\tau_\infty\ \text{ in }\ C^0(\Sigma,\mathbb{R}),\ \ \tau_\infty(x)>0\ \text{ for all }\ x\in\Sigma. \tag{1.3}$$

Clearly u_k is a critical point of the functional

$$J_k(u)=\frac{1}{2}\int_\Sigma\left(|\nabla_g u|^2+\tau_k u^2\right)dv_g-\int_\Sigma F_k(x,u)dv_g \tag{1.4}$$

on the Sobolev space $W^{1,2}(\Sigma,\mathbb{R})$. The existence of nonnegative solutions to the equation (1.2) in the case that τ_k is a positive real number was studied by the author and Zhao in [16] by using a method of variation. More explicitly, assuming that $\lambda_\tau=\lambda_\tau(\Sigma)$ is the first eigenvalue of the operator $\Delta_g+\tau$, where $\tau>0$ is a constant, we proved that the equation $\Delta_g u+\tau u=\lambda ue^{u^2}$ has a nonnegative solution provided that $\lambda<\lambda_\tau$. The purpose of this paper is to study the quantization problem for the equation (1.2). Precisely we shall prove the following result.

Theorem 1.1 *Let (Σ,g) be a compact Riemannian surface without boundary. Suppose that u_k is a sequence of smooth solutions to the equation (1.2), where τ_k is a sequence of smooth functions satisfying (1.3), and f_k is a sequence of functions satisfying* (H1)-(H5). *Let J_k be as in (1.4). If $J_k(u_k)\to\beta$ as $k\to\infty$ for some $\beta\in\mathbb{R}$, then there exists a nonnegative solution $u_\infty\in C^1(\Sigma,\mathbb{R})$ of*

$$\Delta_g u_\infty+\tau_\infty u_\infty=f_\infty(x,u_\infty(x))\quad\text{in}\quad\Sigma, \tag{1.5}$$

and there exists $N\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $J_k(u_k)=J_\infty(u_\infty)+2\pi N+o(1)$, where $o(1)\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$. Here J_∞ is also as in (1.4), where τ_k, F_k are replaced by τ_∞ and F_∞ respectively. If $N=0$, $u_k\to u_\infty$

strongly in $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ *and in fact in* $C^1(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$.

The analogies of Theorem 1.1 were obtained in Euclidean smooth bounded domains several times during the last decade. In [2], Adimurthi and Struwe considered a sequence of solutions u_k to the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_k = f_k(x, u_k) \ \text{ in } \ \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \\ u_k > 0 \ \text{ in } \ \Omega, \ \ u_k = 0 \ \text{ on } \ \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

where $f_k(x,t) = te^{\varphi_k(t)}$, $0 \leq \varphi_k''(t) \leq 2$ for $t \geq t_0$ and $\varphi_k'(t)/t \to 2$ as $t \to \infty$ uniformly in k. Such a function sequence f_k satisfies (H1)-(H5) in the case that the Riemannian surface (Σ, g) is replaced by a smooth bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^2$. Assuming that

$$J_k(u_k) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_k|^2 dx - \int_\Omega F_k(x, u_k) dx \to \beta$$

for $0 \leq \beta < 4\pi$ and that the limit equation does not admit any positive solution with energy less than 2π, they proved that either $u_k \to u_\infty$ strongly in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and u_∞ has energy β, or $u_k \rightharpoonup 0$ weakly in $W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and u_k develops one blow-up point carrying the energy 2π. This quantization result was surprisingly refined by Druet [6] to the case of all $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and general nonlinearities of uniform critical growth, analogous to that of our current paper. Blow-up analysis for equation with similar nonlinearity was also considered by Adimuthi and Druet [1]. The key point in [6] is the gradient estimate ([6], Proposition 2), through which Druet studied the energy of φ_k, the spherical mean of u_k with respect to blow-up points, instead of u_k itself. Thus he transformed the quantization problem for u_k to the quantization problem for φ_k, which depends only on analysis on certain ordinary differential equation and is comparatively easy to be handled. Shortly, using similar idea Struwe [13] succeeded to get a quantization result for a forth order elliptic equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^4}^2 u_k = \lambda_k u_k e^{2u_k^2} \ \text{ in } \ \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \\ u_k > 0 \ \text{ in } \ \Omega, \ \ u_k = \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^4} u_k = 0 \ \text{ on } \ \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $0 < \lambda_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, and $u_k \rightharpoonup 0$ weakly in $W^{2,2}(\Omega)$. Also Lamm, Robert and Struwe [8] proved a quantization result for the evolution of the equation (1.6), where f_k is as in (1.1). A recent inspiring work of Martinazzi and Struwe [10] states the following: Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2m}$ be a smooth bounded domain, $u_k > 0$ be a sequence of positive solutions to the equation $-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_k = \lambda_k u_k e^{mu_k^2}$ subject to Dirichlet boundary conditions, where $0 < \lambda_k \to 0$ and $u_k \rightharpoonup 0$ weakly in $W^{m,2}(\Omega)$. Assuming $\Lambda = \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Omega u_k(-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}})^m u_k dx < \infty$, they proved that Λ is an integer multiple of $\Lambda_1 = (2m-1)!\mathrm{vol}(\mathbb{S}^{2m})$, the total Q-curvature of the standard $2m$-dimensional sphere. In view of the Trudinger-Moser embedding for the space $W_0^{1,n}(\Omega)$, where $n \geq 3$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a smooth bounded domain, one may ask how about the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_n u_k = \lambda_k u_k^{\frac{1}{n-1}} e^{u_k^{\frac{n}{n-1}}} \ \text{ in } \ \Omega \\ u_k \geq 0 \ \text{ in } \ \Omega, \ \ u_k = 0 \ \text{ on } \ \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.7}$$

Up to now only an energy inequality has been obtained by the author and Adimurthi [3]. Concerning the quantization for (1.7), we have a long way to go. For other work related to this kind of quantization problems we refer the reader to [10, 13] and the references their in.

For the proof of Theorem 1.1, we first use a pointwise estimate on u_k to find all separate blow-up points. Specifically we need to deal carefully with the term $\tau_k u_k$, which does not appear in the Euclidean case. Secondly we establish a gradient estimate for u_k on Riemannian surface (Σ, g). This permits us to compare u_k with its spherical mean with respect to blow-up points. Finally, following the lines of [8, 10, 13], we make effort to get quantization results. Again we should deal with the extra term $\tau_k u_k$ carefully. For calculations near blow-up points we prefer to choose isothermal coordinates. The advantage of such coordinates is that both the Laplace-Beltrami operator Δ_g and the gradient operator ∇_g have simple expressions.

The remaining part of this paper is organized as follows. In the next section we prove a simple property of the weak convergence of u_k. In Section 3, we locate the blow-up points of u_k and describe the asymptotic behavior of u_k near those points. In Section 4 we derive a gradient estimate on u_k. We shall prove quantization results for u_k near the blow-up points in Section 5, and complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 6.

Throughout this paper we often denote various constants independent of k by the same C. In addition, we do not distinguish sequence and subsequence or points and sequence sometimes. The reader can easily recognize it from the context.

2. Weak convergence

In this section, we let $u_k \geq 0$ be a sequence of solutions to the equation (1.2) verifying that

$$J_k(u_k) \to \beta \ \text{ as } \ k \to \infty \ \text{ for some } \beta \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.1}$$

where J_k is defined in (1.4). We prove the following result, analogous to ([6], Lemma1).

Lemma 2.1 *Let f_k be a sequence of functions satisfying (H1)-(H4). Let u_k be a sequence of nonnegative smooth solutions to (1.2), where τ_k satisfies as in (1.3). Assume that (2.1) holds. Then (u_k) is bounded in $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$, so that after passing to a subsequence, $u_k \rightharpoonup u_\infty$ weakly in $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$, where $u_\infty \in C^1(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$ is a nonnegative solution to the equation (1.5). Moreover, we have*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Sigma \left(|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2\right) dv_g = 2(\beta - J_\infty(u_\infty)) + \int_\Sigma \left(|\nabla_g u_\infty|^2 + \tau_\infty u_\infty^2\right) dv_g. \tag{2.2}$$

Proof. Firstly we prove that (u_k) is bounded in $W^{1,2}(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$. Testing the equation (1.2) by u_k, we have by integration by parts

$$\int_\Sigma \left(|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2\right) dv_g = \int_\Sigma u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g. \tag{2.3}$$

It follows from (2.1) that

$$\int_\Sigma \left(|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2\right) dv_g = 2\beta + 2\int_\Sigma F_k(x, u_k) dv_g + o(1).$$

Hence

$$\int_\Sigma u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g = 2\beta + 2\int_\Sigma F_k(x, u_k) dv_g + o(1).$$

This together with the hypotheses (H1)-(H3) implies that

$$\int_\Sigma u_k f_k(x,u_k)dv_g \leq C \tag{2.4}$$

for some constant C. In view of (1.3), it follows from (2.3) and (2.4) that u_k is bounded in $W^{1,2}(\Sigma,\mathbb{R})$. Hence there exists some $u_\infty \in W^{1,2}(\Sigma,\mathbb{R})$ such that up to a subsequence, $u_k \rightharpoonup u_\infty$ weakly in $W^{1,2}(\Sigma,\mathbb{R})$, $u_k \to u_\infty$ strongly in $L^2(\Sigma,\mathbb{R})$, and $u_k \to u_\infty$ a.e. in Σ.

Secondly we prove (2.2). Note that $\int_\Sigma \tau_k u_k^2 dv_g \to \int_\Sigma \tau_\infty u_\infty^2 dv_g$ as $k\to\infty$. It suffices to prove

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_\Sigma F_k(x,u_k)dv_g = \int_\Sigma F_\infty(x,u_\infty)dv_g. \tag{2.5}$$

By (H3), for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$F_k(x,u_k) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{C} u_k f_k(x,u_k) + C_\epsilon, \tag{2.6}$$

where C is as in (2.4). Write $\Sigma_k^t = \{x\in\Sigma : u_k(x) > t\}$ and $\Sigma_\infty^t = \{x \in \Sigma : u_\infty(x) \geq t\}$. Take sufficiently large $t_1 > 0$ such that $C_\epsilon|\Sigma_\infty^{t_1}| < \epsilon$, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure. Noting that $\limsup_{k\to\infty}|\Sigma_k^t| \leq |\Sigma_\infty^t|$, we have by using (2.4) and (2.6) that

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty}\int_{\Sigma_k^{t_1}} F_k(x,u_k)dv_g \leq \epsilon + C_\epsilon|\Sigma_\infty^{t_1}| < 2\epsilon. \tag{2.7}$$

Since $F_k(x,u_k) \to F_\infty(x,u_\infty)$ as $k\to\infty$ for almost every $x\in\Sigma$, we have by Fatou's lemma $F_\infty(x,u_\infty) \in L^1(\Sigma,\mathbb{R})$. Thus we can find sufficiently large $t_2 > t_1$ such that $\int_{\Sigma_\infty^{t_2}} F_\infty(x,u_\infty)dv_g < \epsilon$. This together with (2.7) leads to

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty}\int_{\Sigma_k^{t_2}} |F_k(x,u_k) - F_\infty(x,u_\infty)|dv_g < 3\epsilon.$$

On the other hand, in view of (H2), the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem implies that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\Sigma\setminus\Sigma_k^{t_2}} |F_k(x,u_k) - F_\infty(x,u_\infty)|dv_g = 0.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, we conclude

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_\Sigma |F_k(x,u_k) - F_\infty(x,u_\infty)|dv_g = 0.$$

Particularly we have (2.5).

Finally, in a same way as we derive (2.5), we obtain

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_\Sigma f_k(x,u_k)\varphi dv_g = \int_\Sigma f_\infty(x,u_\infty)\varphi dv_g$$

for any $\varphi \in C^\infty(\Sigma,\mathbb{R})$. Testing the equation (1.2) by φ, we have by passing to the limit $k\to\infty$,

$$\int_\Sigma (\nabla_g u_\infty \nabla_g\varphi + \tau_\infty u_\infty\varphi)dv_g = \int_\Sigma f_\infty(x,u_\infty)\varphi dv_g.$$

Thus u_∞ is a weak solution of (1.5). By (H4), there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that for all $t \geq t_0$, $f_k(x,t) \leq f_k(x,t_0)e^{2(t^2-t_0^2)}$. Letting $k\to\infty$, we have $f_\infty(x,t) \leq f_\infty(x,t_0)e^{2(t^2-t_0^2)}$ for all $t\geq t_0$. Then Orlicz embedding implies that $f_\infty(x,u_\infty) \in L^p(\Sigma,\mathbb{R})$ for all $p\geq 1$. Applying elliptic estimates to (1.5), we have that $u_\infty \in C^1(\Sigma,\mathbb{R})$. □

3. Multibubble analysis

In this section we shall use the pointwise estimate to find blow-up points of a sequence of solutions to the equation (1.2). This technique was first used by Druet [6] to deal with blow-up analysis for solutions to the equation (1.6). Assume $u_k \geq 0$ is a sequence of solutions to the equation (1.2) and (2.1) holds. From (2.3) and (2.4) we can find some constant C such that

$$\int_\Sigma \left(|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2\right) dv_g \leq C. \tag{3.1}$$

Then the Sobolev embedding theorem implies that for any $p > 1$ there is some constant C such that

$$\int_\Sigma u_k^p dv_g \leq C. \tag{3.2}$$

These two properties are very important during the process of exhausting blow-up points. Precisely we have the following proposition which is analogous to ([6], Proposition 1), ([8], Theorem 4.2), ([9], Theorem 1 in the case $m = 1$) and ([3], Proposition 3.1).

Proposition 3.1 *Let (Σ, g) be a compact Riemannian surface without boundary, (f_k) be a sequence of functions satisfying the hypotheses* (H1)-(H5)*, and (u_k) be a sequence of smooth nonnegative solutions to (1.2) such that (2.1) holds. Assume that $\max_\Sigma u_k \to +\infty$ as $k \to \infty$. Then there exists $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, and up to a subsequence, there exist N sequences of points $x_{i,k} \to x_i^* \in \Sigma$ and of positive real numbers $r_{i,k} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, where $r_{i,k}$ is defined by*

$$r_{i,k}^{-2} = u_k(x_{i,k}) f_k(x_{i,k}, u_k(x_{i,k})), \tag{3.3}$$

such that the following hold:

(i) *For any $i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$, take an isothermal coordinate system $(U_i, \phi_i; \{x^1, x^2\})$ near x_i^*, where $U_i \subset \Sigma$ is a neighborhood of x_i^*, $\phi_i : U_i \to \Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a diffeomorphism and $\phi_i(x_i^*) = (0, 0)$. If we define*

$$\eta_{i,k}(x) = u_k(x_{i,k})(\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_{i,k}x) - u_k(x_{i,k})) \tag{3.4}$$

for all $x \in \Omega_{i,k} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_{i,k} \in \Omega_i\}$, where $\widetilde{x}_{i,k} = \phi_i(x_{i,k})$ and $\widetilde{u}_k = u_k \circ \phi_i^{-1}$, then there holds

$$\eta_{i,k}(x) \to \eta_\infty(x) = \log \frac{1}{1 + |x|^2} \quad \text{in} \quad C^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2);$$

(ii) *For any $1 \leq i \neq j \leq N$, there holds*

$$\frac{d_g(x_{i,k}, x_{j,k})}{r_{i,k}} \to +\infty, \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty,$$

where $d_g(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the geodesic distance between two points of Σ;
(iii) *Define $R_{N,k}(x) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} d_g(x, x_{i,k})$ for $x \in \Sigma$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$R_{N,k}^2(x) u_k(x) f_k(x, u_k(x)) \leq C$$

uniformly in $x \in \Sigma$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Moreover, given any sequence of points $(x_{N+1,k})$*, it is impossible to extract a new subsequence from the previous one such that* (i) – (iii) *hold with the sequences* $(x_{i,k})$, $i = 1, \cdots, N+1$.

Finally, we have $u_k \to u_\infty$ *in* $C^1_{\text{loc}}(\Sigma \setminus \mathcal{S})$ *as* $k \to \infty$*, where* $\mathcal{S} = \{x_1^*, \cdots, x_N^*\}$*, and* u_∞ *is given in Lemma 2.1.*

Proof. We divide the proof into several steps.

Step 1. *The first bubble.*

Assume $u_k(x_k) = \max_\Sigma u_k$. If $u_k(x_k)$ is bound, then applying elliptic estimates to the equation (1.2) we have $u_k \to u_\infty$ in $C^1(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$, where u_∞ is given by Lemma 2.1. Hereafter we assume $u_k(x_k) \to +\infty$. Set

$$r_k^{-2} = u_k(x_k) f_k(x_k, u_k(x_k)). \tag{3.5}$$

It is clear that $r_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. For otherwise, it follows from (H2) that $f_k(x_k, u_k(x_k))$ is bounded. Combining (H4) and (H5), we conclude that $f_k(x, u_k(x))$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$. In view of (1.3) and (3.2), applying elliptic estimates to the equation (1.2) again we have $u_k \to u_\infty$ in $C^1(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$. This contradicts the assumption $u_k(x_k) \to +\infty$, and thus concludes $r_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.

Assume $x_k \to x^*$ as $k \to \infty$. Take an isothermal coordinate system $(U, \phi; \{x^1, x^2\})$ near x^*, where $U \subset \Sigma$ is a neighborhood of x^*, $\phi : U \to \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a diffeomorphism and $\phi(x^*) = (0,0)$. In such a coordinate system, the metric g can be represented by

$$g = e^{\psi}(dx^{1^2} + dx^{2^2})$$

for some smooth function $\psi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\psi(0,0) = 0$. It follows that

$$\nabla_g = e^{-\psi} \nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}, \quad \Delta_g = -e^{-\psi} \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}, \tag{3.6}$$

where $\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ and $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ denote the usual gradient operator and the Laplace operator of $\mathbb{R}^2$ respectively. The existence of isothermal coordinate system on Riemannian surface is a well-known fact in Riemannian geometry, see for example [15]. Define

$$v_k(x) = \frac{\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x)}{u_k(x_k)} \tag{3.7}$$

for $x \in \Omega_k = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \widetilde{x}_k + r_k x \in \Omega\}$, where $\widetilde{u}_k = u_k \circ \phi^{-1}$, $\widetilde{x}_k = \phi(x_k)$. It follows from (1.2), (3.5) and (3.6) that v_k satisfies the following equation

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(x) = e^{\psi(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x)} \frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x))}{u_k^2(x_k) f_k(x_k, u_k(x_k))} - e^{\psi(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x)} r_k^2 \widetilde{\tau}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x) v_k(x) \tag{3.8}$$

on Ω_k, where $\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x, t) = f_k(\phi^{-1}(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x), t)$. Note that $u_k(x_k) = \max_\Sigma u_k$ and $\Omega_k \to \mathbb{R}^2$ as $k \to \infty$. It follows from (3.7) that v_k is uniformly bounded in $\mathbb{B}_R(0)$ for any fixed $R > 0$. Since ψ is smooth, $\psi(0,0) = 0$, $\widetilde{x}_k \to (0,0)$ and $r_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, $e^{\psi(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x)}$ is also uniformly bounded in $\mathbb{B}_R(0)$ for any fixed $R > 0$. Furthermore $e^{\psi(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x)} \to 1$ locally uniformly in $\mathbb{R}^2$ as $k \to \infty$. By (H4) and (H5), we have for all $x \in \Omega_k$ and all k

$$\frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x))}{f_k(x_k, u_k(x_k))} \leq C. \tag{3.9}$$

All these estimates together with (1.3) lead to

$$\| -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{B}_R(0))} \to 0 \ \text{ as } \ k \to \infty, \ \forall R > 0.$$

Applying elliptic estimates to (3.8), one gets $v_k \to v_\infty$ in $C^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, where v_∞ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_\infty = 0 \ \text{ in } \ \mathbb{R}^2 \\ v_\infty(0) = 1 = \max_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_\infty. \end{cases}$$

The Liouville theorem for harmonic functions then leads to $v_\infty \equiv 1$. Therefore

$$v_k \to 1 \quad \text{in} \quad C^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{3.10}$$

Now we set

$$\eta_k(x) = u_k(x_k)(\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x) - u_k(x_k)).$$

In view of (1.2), η_k satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_k(x) \quad &= \quad e^{\psi(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x)} \frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x))}{f_k(x_k, u_k(x_k))} \\ &\quad\ - e^{\psi(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x)} \widetilde{\tau}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x) r_k^2 u_k^2(x_k) v_k(x), \quad x \in \Omega_k. \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

We claim that

$$r_k u_k^p(x_k) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty, \quad \forall p > 1. \tag{3.12}$$

Actually, it is clear that there exists some constant $c > 0$ depending only on the diffeomorphism ϕ such that for any fixed $R > 0$ and all large k

$$B_{c^{-1}Rr_k}(x_k) \subset \phi^{-1}\left(\mathbb{B}_{Rr_k}(\widetilde{x}_k)\right) \subset B_{cRr_k}(x_k). \tag{3.13}$$

Here and throughout this paper we denote the geodesic ball centered at $x \in \Sigma$ with radius r by $B_r(x)$, while the Euclidean ball centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with radius r by $\mathbb{B}_r(x)$. This together with (3.10), the mean value theorem for integral and the Hölder inequality leads to

$$\begin{aligned} r_k u_k^p(x_k) \quad &= \quad \frac{r_k}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{B}_1(0)} u_k^p(x_k) dx \\ &= \quad (1 + o(1)) \frac{r_k}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{B}_1(0)} \widetilde{u}_k^p(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x) dx \\ &\leq \quad (1 + o(1)) \frac{r_k}{\pi^{1/3}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{B}_1(0)} \widetilde{u}_k^{3p}(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x) dx \right)^{1/3} \\ &\leq \quad (1 + o(1)) \frac{r_k^{1/3}}{\pi^{1/3}} \left(\int_{B_{cr_k}(x_k)} u_k^{3p} dv_g \right)^{1/3}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ for any fixed $p > 1$. In view of (3.2), our claim (3.12) follows from (3.14) immediately.

For any fixed $R > 0$ we let $\eta_k^{(1)}$ be a solution to the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_k^{(1)} = -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta_k \ \text{ in } \ \mathbb{B}_R(0) \\ \eta_k^{(1)} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial \mathbb{B}_R(0). \end{cases} \tag{3.15}$$

In view of (3.11), we have by (3.9) and (3.12) that $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta_k$ is bounded in $L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Applying elliptic estimates to (3.15), we have

$$\eta_k^{(1)} \to \eta_\infty^{(1)} \quad \text{in} \quad C^1(\mathbb{B}_R(0)). \tag{3.16}$$

Let $\eta_k^{(2)} = \eta_k - \eta_k^{(1)}$. Then $\eta_k^{(2)}$ satisfies

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta_k^{(2)} = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{B}_R(0). \tag{3.17}$$

It follows from (3.16) and $\eta_k \le 0$ that there exists some constant C such that $\eta_k^{(2)}(x) \le C$ for all k and all $x \in \mathbb{B}_R(0)$. Applying the Harnack inequality to (3.17), we conclude that $\eta_k^{(2)}$ is uniformly bounded on $\mathbb{B}_{R/2}(0)$. Hence η_k is also uniformly bounded in $\mathbb{B}_{R/2}(0)$. Applying elliptic estimates to (3.11), we obtain

$$\eta_k \to \eta_\infty \quad \text{in} \quad C^1(\mathbb{B}_{R/4}(0)).$$

This together with (H4), (H5) and (3.10) gives

$$\frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x))}{f_k(x_k, u_k(x_k))} = (1 + o(1))e^{(2+o(1))\eta_\infty} \tag{3.18}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{B}_{R/4}(0)$, where $o(1) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ uniformly in $x \in \mathbb{B}_{R/4}(0)$. Inserting (3.12) and (3.18) into (3.11) and noting that $R > 0$ is arbitrary we obtain

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta_\infty = e^{2\eta_\infty} \ \text{ in } \ \mathbb{R}^2 \\ \eta_\infty(0) = 0 = \max_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta_\infty. \end{cases} \tag{3.19}$$

Moreover, using (2.4), (3.5), (3.10), (3.13) and (3.18), we estimate for any fixed $R > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}_R} e^{2\eta_\infty} dx &= \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_R(0)} \frac{\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x)\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_k + r_k x))}{u_k(x_k) f_k(x_k, u_k(x_k))} dx \\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{Rr_k}(\widetilde{x}_k)} \widetilde{u}_k(x)\widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k(x)) dx \\ &\le \limsup_{k\to\infty} \int_{B_{cRr_k}(x_k)} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g \le C. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta_\infty(x)} dx < \infty.$$

A result of Chen-Li [5] implies that

$$\eta_\infty(x) = -\log(1 + |x|^2/4), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{3.20}$$

It follows from (3.13) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_{c^{-1}Rr_k}(\widetilde{x}_k)} \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) e^{\psi(x)} dx \le \int_{B_{Rr_k}(x_k)} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g \le \int_{\mathbb{B}_{cRr_k}(\widetilde{x}_k)} \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) e^{\psi(x)} dx.$$

In view of (3.10) and (3.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{R\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{cRr_k}(\widetilde{x}_k)} \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) e^{\psi(x)} dx &= \lim_{R\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{c^{-1}Rr_k}(\widetilde{x}_k)} \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) e^{\psi(x)} dx \\ &= \lim_{R\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{c^{-1}R}(0)} e^{2\eta_\infty} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta_\infty} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain by (3.20)

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{B_{Rr_k}(x_k)} u_k f_k(x,u_k)dv_g = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta_\infty}(x)dx = 4\pi. \tag{3.21}$$

Step 2. Multi-bubble analysis

In this step, we shall prove that there exists some positive integer ℓ such that the properties $(\mathcal{B}_\ell)$ and $(\mathcal{G}_\ell)$ hold. Namely, there exist ℓ sequences of points $(x_{i,k})\subset\Sigma$ such that $x_{i,k}\to x_i^*$ as $k\to\infty$, $1\leq i\leq\ell$, and the following are satisfied:

$(\mathcal{B}_\ell^1)$ For every $i : 1\leq i\leq\ell$, letting $r_{i,k}>0$ be given by (3.3), $(U_i,\phi_i;\{x^1,x^2\})$ be an isothermal coordinate system near x_i^*, where $U_i\subset\Sigma$ is a neighborhood of x_i^*, $\phi_i : U_i\to\Omega_i\subset\mathbb{R}^2$ is a diffeomorphism with $\phi_i(x_i^*)=(0,0)$, and letting $\eta_{i,k}$ be given by (3.4), we have that $r_{i,k}\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$ and

$$\eta_{i,k}(x)\to\eta_\infty(x) = -\log(1+|x|^2/4) \quad \text{in} \quad C^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2) \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty;$$

$(\mathcal{B}_\ell^2)$ For all $1\leq i\neq j\leq\ell$,

$$\frac{d_g(x_{i,k},x_{j,k})}{r_{i,k}}\to\infty \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty;$$

$(\mathcal{B}_\ell^3)$ There holds the energy identity

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\cup_{i=1}^{\ell}B_{Rr_{i,k}}(x_{i,k})} u_k f_k(x,u_k)dv_g = 4\pi\ell;$$

$(\mathcal{G}_\ell)$ There exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$R^2_{\ell,k}(x)u_k(x)f_k(x,u_k(x))\leq C$$

for all $x\in\Sigma$ and all $k\in\mathbb{N}$. Here

$$R_{\ell,k}(x) = \min_{1\leq i\leq\ell} d_g(x,x_{i,k}). \tag{3.22}$$

From Step 1, we know that $(\mathcal{B}_1)$ holds. Suppose for some $\ell\geq 1$, $(\mathcal{B}_\ell)$ holds but $(\mathcal{G}_\ell)$ does not hold. Choose $x_{\ell+1,k}\in\Sigma$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} R^2_{\ell,k}(x_{\ell+1,k})u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})f_k(x_{\ell+1,k},u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})) &= \max_{x\in\Sigma} R^2_{\ell,k}(x)u_k(x)f_k(x,u_k(x)) \\ &\to +\infty \quad \text{as} \quad k\to\infty. \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Let $r_{\ell+1,k}>0$ be as defined in (3.3). It follows from (3.3), (3.22), and (3.23) that $r_{\ell+1,k}\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$ and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{d_g(x_{\ell+1,k},x_{i,k})}{r_{\ell+1,k}} = +\infty, \quad \forall 1\leq i\leq\ell. \tag{3.24}$$

Also we claim that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{d_g(x_{\ell+1,k},x_{i,k})}{r_{i,k}} = +\infty, \quad \forall 1\leq i\leq\ell. \tag{3.25}$$

Suppose not. There exists some constant C such that for some $1 \le i \le \ell$, there holds

$$d_g(x_{\ell+1,k}, x_{i,k}) \le C r_{i,k} \quad \text{for all} \quad k.$$

Hence we have

$$R^2_{\ell,k}(x_{\ell+1,k}) u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})) \le C r^2_{i,k} u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})) \tag{3.26}$$

By $(\mathscr{B}^1_\ell)$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} r^2_{i,k} u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})) &= \frac{1+o(1)}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{r_{i,k}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k(x) \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k(x)) e^{\psi_i(x)} dx \\ &\le \frac{1+o(1)}{\pi} \int_\Sigma u_k(x) f_k(x, u_k(x)) dv_g. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (2.4) implies that $r^2_{i,k} u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))$ is a bounded sequence, and whence (3.26) implies that $R^2_{\ell,k}(x_{\ell+1,k}) u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))$ is bounded. This contradicts (3.23). Hence our claim (3.25) holds, and thus $(\mathscr{B}^2_{\ell+1})$ holds.

Assume $x_{\ell+1,k} \to x^*_{\ell+1}$ as $k \to \infty$. Take an isothermal coordinate system $(U_{\ell+1}, \phi_{\ell+1}; \{x^1, x^2\})$ near $x^*_{\ell+1}$, where $U_{\ell+1}$ is a neighborhood of $x^*_{\ell+1}$, $\phi_{\ell+1} : U_{\ell+1} \to \Omega_{\ell+1} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a diffeomorphism with $\phi_{\ell+1}(x^*_{\ell+1}) = (0,0)$. In this coordinate system, the Riemannian metric g can be represented by

$$g = e^{\psi_{\ell+1}} ({dx^1}^2 + {dx^2}^2)$$

for some smooth function $\psi_{\ell+1} : \Omega_{\ell+1} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\psi_{\ell+1}(0,0) = 0$. Also we have $\nabla_g = e^{-\psi_{\ell+1}} \nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ and $\Delta_g = -e^{-\psi_{\ell+1}} \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}$.

Define

$$v_{\ell+1,k}(x) = \frac{\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k} x)}{u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})}$$

for $x \in \Omega_{\ell+1,k} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k} x \in \Omega_{\ell+1}\}$, where $\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} = \phi_{\ell+1}(x_{\ell+1,k})$, $\widetilde{u}_k = u_k \circ \phi^{-1}_{\ell+1}$. Now we prove that

$$v_{\ell+1,k} \to 1 \quad \text{in} \quad C^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \tag{3.27}$$

In view of (1.2), $v_{\ell+1,k}$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_{\ell+1,k}(x) &= e^{\psi_{\ell+1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k} x)} \frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k} x, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k} x))}{u^2_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))} \\ &\quad - e^{\psi_{\ell+1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k} x)} r^2_{\ell+1,k} \widetilde{\tau}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k} x) v_{\ell+1,k}(x) \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

on $\Omega_{\ell+1,k}$, where $\widetilde{f}_k(x,t) = f_k(\phi^{-1}_{\ell+1}(x), t)$. By (3.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\widetilde{R}^2_{\ell,k}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k} x) \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k} x) \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k} x, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k} x)) \\ &\le R^2_{\ell,k}(x_{\ell+1,k}) u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}) f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})), \end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

where $\widetilde{R}_{\ell,k} = R_{\ell,k} \circ \phi^{-1}_{\ell+1}$. Fix any i, $1 \le i \le \ell$. If $x^*_{\ell+1} \ne x^*_i$, noting that $d_g(\phi^{-1}_{\ell+1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k} x), x_{i,k}) \to d_g(x^*_{\ell+1}, x^*_i)$ and $d_g(x_{\ell+1,k}, x_{i,k}) \to d_g(x^*_{\ell+1}, x^*_i)$ as $k \to \infty$, we then have

$$d_g(\phi^{-1}_{\ell+1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k} x), x_{i,k}) = (1 + o(1)) d_g(x_{\ell+1,k}, x_{i,k}), \tag{3.30}$$

where $o(1)\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$ uniformly in $x\in\mathbb{B}_R(0)$. If $x^*_{\ell+1}=x^*_i$, since the Riemannian distance and the Euclidean distance are equivalent in the same local coordinate system, we then have $|\phi_{\ell+1}(x_{\ell+1,k})-\phi_{\ell+1}(x_{i,k})|=(1+o(1))d_g(x_{\ell+1,k},x_{i,k})$. Recalling (3.24), we obtain for all $x\in\mathbb{B}_R(0)$

$$\begin{aligned} d_g(\phi^{-1}_{\ell+1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}x),x_{i,k}) &= (1+o(1))|\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}x-\phi_{\ell+1}(x_{i,k})| \\ &= (1+o(1))d_g(x_{\ell+1,k},x_{i,k}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have (3.30) in any case. Combining (3.29) and (3.30), we obtain for $x\in\mathbb{B}_R(0)$

$$\begin{aligned} & v_{\ell+1,k}(x)\frac{\widetilde{f_k}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}x,\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}x))}{f_k(x_{\ell+1,k},u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))} \\ & \le \frac{\inf_{1\le i\le\ell} d_g(x_{\ell+1,k},x_{i,k})^2}{\inf_{1\le i\le\ell} d_g(\phi^{-1}_{\ell+1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}x),x_{i,k})^2}=1+o(1), \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

where $o(1)\to 0$ uniformly in $x\in\mathbb{B}_R(0)$. From (H4), we know that there exists $t_0>0$ such that

$$\frac{f_k(x,t_2)}{f_k(x,t_1)}\ge e^{t_2^2-t_1^2}\ \text{ for all } t_1,t_2\ge t_0,\ \text{ and all } x\in\Sigma. \tag{3.32}$$

If there exist some $R_0>0$ and a sequence of points $(z_k)\subset\mathbb{B}_{R_0}(0)$ such that $v_{\ell+1,k}(z_k)\to\alpha>1$ as $k\to\infty$, then we conclude by (3.32) and (H5) that

$$v_{\ell+1,k}(z_k)\frac{\widetilde{f_k}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}z_k,\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}z_k))}{f_k(x_{\ell+1,k},u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))}\ge\frac{\alpha+1}{2}>1$$

for sufficiently large k, which contradicts (3.31). Therefore we obtain

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty}\|v_{\ell+1,k}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{B}_R(0))}\le 1,\quad \forall R>0.$$

When $v_{\ell+1,k}(x)>1$, we have by (3.28) and (3.31), $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}v_{\ell+1,k}(x)=o(1)$, where $o(1)$ is the same meaning as that of (3.31). When $v_{\ell+1,k}(x)\le 1$, using (H4) and (H5), we also have $\Delta v_{\ell+1,k}(x)=o(1)$, where $o(1)\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$ uniformly in all x satisfying $v_{\ell+1,k}(x)\le 1$ for sufficiently large k. Now applying elliptic estimates to the equation (3.28), we obtain

$$v_{\ell+1,k}\to v_{\ell+1,\infty}\quad\text{in}\quad C^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

where $v_{\ell+1,\infty}$ is a solution to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}v_{\ell+1,\infty}=0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2 \\ 0\le v_{\ell+1,\infty}\le 1. \end{cases}$$

Note that $v_{\ell+1,\infty}(0)=1$. The Liouville theorem for harmonic functions leads to $v_{\ell+1,\infty}\equiv 1$. Whence (3.27) holds.

Define another sequence of blow-up functions by

$$\eta_{\ell+1,k}(x)=u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})(\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}x)-u_k(x_{\ell+1,k})),\quad x\in\Omega_{\ell+1,k}. \tag{3.33}$$

In the following, we will prove that $(\mathscr{B}^1_{\ell+1})$ and $(\mathscr{B}^3_{\ell+1})$ hold. By (1.2), $\eta_{\ell+1,k}$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta_{\ell+1,k}(x) &= e^{\psi_{\ell+1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}x)}\frac{\widetilde{f_k}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}x,\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}x))}{f_k(x_{\ell+1,k},u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))} \\ &\quad -e^{\psi_{\ell+1}(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}x)}\widetilde{\tau}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}x)r^2_{\ell+1,k}u^2_k(x_{\ell+1,k})v_{\ell+1,k}(x) \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

on $\Omega_{\ell+1,k}$. We claim that for any fixed $R > 0$,

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \eta_{\ell+1,k}(x) \le 0 \text{ uniformly in } x \in \mathbb{B}_R(0). \tag{3.35}$$

For otherwise, we may take a sequence of points $(y_k) \subset \mathbb{B}_R(0)$ such that $\eta_{\ell+1,k}(y_k) \ge \beta > 0$ for all sufficiently large k. By (H4), (H5) and (3.27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}y_k, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k} + r_{\ell+1,k}y_k))}{f_k(x_{\ell+1,k}, u_k(x_{\ell+1,k}))} &= (1+o(1))e^{\widetilde{u}_k^2(\widetilde{x}_{\ell+1,k}+r_{\ell+1,k}y_k)-u_k^2(x_{\ell+1,k})} \\ &= (1+o(1))e^{(2+o(1))\eta_{\ell+1,k}(y_k)} \\ &\ge 1 + 2\beta + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

This together with (3.31) leads to

$$1 + 2\beta + o(1) \le 1 + o(1),$$

which is impossible when k is sufficiently large. Hence our claim (3.35) holds. By (3.27), using the same method of deriving (3.12), we conclude

$$r_{\ell+1,k}^2 u_k^2(x_{\ell+1,k}) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \tag{3.36}$$

Combining (3.27) and (3.33)-(3.36), similarly as we did in Step 1, we arrive at

$$\eta_{\ell+1,k}(x) \to \eta_\infty(x) \text{ in } C^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ as } k \to \infty,$$

where $\eta_\infty(x) = -\log(1 + |x|^2/4)$ is the unique solution to (3.19). Hence $(\mathcal{B}^1_{\ell+1})$ holds.

Moreover, using the same method of proving (3.21), we arrive at

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{B_{Rr_{\ell+1,k}}(x_{\ell+1,k})} u_k f_k(x,u_k)dv_g = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta_\infty(x)}dx = 4\pi.$$

Thus $(\mathcal{B}^3_{\ell+1})$ holds.

Actually, we have proved that if $(\mathcal{B}_\ell)$ holds but $(\mathcal{G}_\ell)$ does not hold, then $(\mathcal{B}_{\ell+1})$ holds. Note that

$$\int_\Sigma u_k f_k(x,u_k)dv_g \ge \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1}\int_{B_{Rr_{i,k}}(x_{i,k})} u_k f_k(x,u_k)dv_g = 4(\ell+1)\pi. \tag{3.37}$$

In view of (2.4), the process must be terminate after finite steps. This ends the proof of Step 2.

Step 3. Exhaustion of blow-up points

It follows from Step 2 that there exists some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0\}$ and ℓ sequences of points $(x_{i,k})$, $i = 1,\cdots,\ell$, such that $(\mathcal{B}_\ell)$ and $(\mathcal{G}_\ell)$ hold. If there exists a sequence of points $(x_{\ell+1,k})$ of Σ such that after extracting a new subsequence from the previous one, $(\mathcal{B}_{\ell+1})$ and $(\mathcal{G}_{\ell+1})$ hold, we add this sequence of points, and so on. The process necessarily terminates because of (2.4) and (3.37). Therefore there exists some $N \in \mathbb{N}\setminus\{0\}$ and N sequences of points $(x_{i,k})$, $i = 1,\cdots,N$, such that $(\mathcal{B}_N)$ and $(\mathcal{G}_N)$ hold and such that, given any sequence of points $(x_{N+1,k})$, it is impossible to extract a new subsequence from the previous one such that $(\mathcal{B}_{N+1})$ and $(\mathcal{G}_{N+1})$ hold with sequences $(x_{i,k})$, $i = 1, \cdots, N+1$.

Step 4. Convergence away from blow-up points

Set $\mathcal{S} = \{x_1^*, \cdots, x_N^*\}$. We will prove that $u_k \to u_\infty$ in $C^1_{\rm loc}(\Sigma \setminus \mathcal{S})$. In view of $(\mathcal{G}_N)$, given any compact set $K \subset \Sigma \setminus \mathcal{S}$, there exists a constant C such that

$$u_k(x) f_k(x, u_k(x)) \leq C \text{ for all } x \in K \text{ and all } k.$$

If $u_k(x) > 1$ for some $x \in K$, then $f_k(x, u_k(x)) \leq C_K$. If $u_k(x) \leq 1$ for some $x \in K$, then (H2) implies that $f_k(x, u_k(x))$ is bounded uniformly in x with $u_k(x) \leq 1$. Thus, for all $x \in K$, $f_k(x, u_k(x))$ is bounded in $L^\infty(K)$. In view of (1.3) and (3.2), applying elliptic estimates to the equation

$$\Delta_g u_k(x) + \tau_k(x) u_k(x) = f_k(x, u_k(x)), \quad x \in K,$$

we obtain the convergence $u_k \to u_0$ in $C^1_{\rm loc}(\Sigma \setminus \mathcal{S})$.

Combining the above four Steps, we complete the proof of Proposition 3.1. $\square$

4. Gradient estimate

Let $u_k \geq 0$ be a sequence of solutions to (1.2). In this section we shall establish a gradient estimate on u_k, which can be viewed as a manifold version of ([6], Proposition 2). Precisely we have the following result.

Proposition 4.1 *Let* (Σ, g) *be a compact Riemannian surface without boundary,* f_k *be a sequence of functions satisfying* (H1)-(H5), *and* $u_k \geq 0$ *be a sequence of smooth solutions to the equation (1.2) such that (2.1) holds. Assume that* $\max_\Sigma u_k \to +\infty$ *as* $k \to \infty$. *Let* $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ *and the sequences* $x_{i,k}$, $i = 1, \cdots, N$, *be given by Proposition 3.1. Then there exists a uniform constant C such that*

$$R_{N,k}(x) u_k(x) |\nabla_g u_k(x)| \leq C$$

for all $x \in \Sigma$ *and all* k, *where* $R_{N,k}(x)$ *is as defined in (3.22).*

Proof. Choose $y_k \in \Sigma$ such that

$$R_{N,k}(y_k) u_k(y_k) |\nabla_g u_k(y_k)| = \max_{x \in \Sigma} R_{N,k}(x) u_k(x) |\nabla_g u_k(x)|. \tag{4.1}$$

Suppose by contradiction that

$$R_{N,k}(y_k) u_k(y_k) |\nabla_g u_k(y_k)| \to +\infty \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \tag{4.2}$$

Set

$$s_k = R_{N,k}(y_k). \tag{4.3}$$

By Proposition 3.1, we have $u_k \to u_\infty$ in $C^1_{\rm loc}(\Sigma \setminus \{x_1^*, \cdots, x_N^*\})$, which together with (4.2) implies that $s_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $y_k \to x_1^*$ as $k \to \infty$, $x_1^* = \cdots = x_\ell^*$ for some $1 \leq \ell \leq N$, and $x_j^* \neq x_1^*$ for any $j \in \{\ell+1, \cdots, N\}$. Take an isothermal coordinate system $(U, \phi; \{x^1, x^2\})$ near x_1^*, where U is a neighborhood of $x_1^* \in \Sigma$, $\phi : U \to \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$

is a diffeomorphism with $\phi(x_1^*) = (0,0)$. In this coordinate system the Riemannian metric g can be represented by $g = e^{\psi}({dx^1}^2 + {dx^2}^2)$, where $\psi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function with $\psi(0,0) = 0$. Denote $\widetilde{y}_k = \phi(y_k)$, $\widetilde{u}_k = u_k \circ \phi^{-1}$. We set

$$v_k(y) = \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y)$$

for $y \in \Omega_k = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \widetilde{y}_k + s_k y \in \Omega\}$. Define

$$y_{i,k} = \frac{\widetilde{x}_{i,k} - \widetilde{y}_k}{s_k} \in \Omega_k, \quad i = 1, \cdots, \ell,$$

and

$$\widetilde{S}_k = \{y_{1,k}, \cdots, y_{\ell,k}\}.$$

Since $s_k \to 0$, we have $\Omega_k \to \mathbb{R}^2$ as $k \to \infty$. Denote

$$\widetilde{S} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \widetilde{S}_k.$$

By (4.3) and the fact $\psi(0,0) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(0, \widetilde{S}_k) &= \inf_{1\le i\le\ell} |y_{i,k}| = \inf_{1\le i\le\ell} \frac{|\widetilde{x}_{i,k} - \widetilde{y}_k|}{s_k} \\ &= \inf_{1\le i\le\ell} \frac{(1+o(1))d_g(x_{i,k}, y_k)}{s_k} \\ &= 1 + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(0, \widetilde{S}) = 1, \tag{4.4}$$

where $d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\cdot,\cdot)$ denotes the Euclidean distance of $\mathbb{R}^2$. Clearly, $v_k(y)$ satisfies

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(y) = e^{\psi(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y)} s_k^2 \left(\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y)) - \widetilde{\tau}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y) v_k(y) \right) \tag{4.5}$$

for $y \in \Omega_k$. By (*iii*) of Proposition 3.1, we have

$$\widetilde{R}_{N,k}(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y)^2 v_k(y) \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y, v_k(y)) \le C \tag{4.6}$$

for some constant C independent of k. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{R}_{N,k}(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y) &= R_{N,k}(\phi^{-1}(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y)) \\ &= \inf_{1\le i\le\ell} d_g(\phi^{-1}(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y), x_{i,k}) \\ &= (1+o(1)) \inf_{1\le i\le\ell} d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y, \widetilde{x}_{i,k}) \\ &= (1+o(1)) s_k d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(y, \widetilde{S}_k). \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Combining (4.6) and (4.7), we have

$$s_k^2 v_k(y) \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y, v_k(y)) \le \frac{C}{d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(y, \widetilde{S}_k)^2}, \tag{4.8}$$

which together with (H1) and (H2) leads to

$$0 \leq s_k^2 \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y, v_k(y)) \leq \frac{C}{d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(y, \widetilde{S}_k)^2}. \tag{4.9}$$

In view of (3.2), we estimate for any $p > 1$ and any $R > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}_R(0)} (s_k^2 v_k(y))^p dy &= s_k^{2p} \int_{\mathbb{B}_R(0)} \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y)^p dy \\ &\leq C s_k^{2p-2} \int_\Sigma u_k^p dv_g \\ &\to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Denote for any $R > 0$

$$A_R = \mathbb{B}_R(0) \setminus \cup_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{B}_{1/R}(y).$$

Clearly there exists some $R_0 > 0$ such that $A_{R/4}$ is necessarily smooth bounded domain provided that $R \geq R_0$. Now we take $R \geq R_0$. In view of (1.3), (4.5), (4.9), and (4.10), we arrive at

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \|\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k\|_{L^p(A_R)} = 0, \quad \forall R \geq R_0, \quad \forall p > 1.$$

Let w_k satisfy

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} w_k = -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k \quad \text{in} \quad A_R \\ w_k = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial A_R. \end{cases}$$

It follows from (4.10) and elliptic estimates that there exists some function w such that

$$w_k \to w \quad \text{in} \quad C^1(\overline{A_R}).$$

Particularly w_k is uniformly bounded in A_R. While $v_k - w_k$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} (v_k - w_k) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad A_R \\ v_k - w_k = v_k \quad \text{on} \quad \partial A_R. \end{cases} \tag{4.11}$$

We claim that

$$v_k(0) \to +\infty \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \tag{4.12}$$

For otherwise, $(v_k(0) - w_k(0))$ is a bounded sequence. Noting that $v_k - w_k$ has lower bound in A_R, and applying Harnack's inequality to (4.11), we obtain

$$\|v_k - w_k\|_{L^\infty(A_{R/2})} \leq C$$

for some constant C depending only on R. Then elliptic estimates together with (**??**) imply that v_k is bounded in $C^1(A_{R/4})$. In view of (4.4), this leads to

$$v_k(0)|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(0)| \leq C.$$

While (4.1) and (4.2) implies

$$v_k(0)|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(0)| \to +\infty \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \tag{4.13}$$

This is a contradiction. Hence our claim (4.12) follows.

Replacing v_k by $v_k/v_k(0)$ in the above estimates, we obtain

$$\frac{v_k}{v_k(0)} \to 1 \quad \text{in} \quad C^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}) \tag{4.14}$$

as $k \to \infty$. For $y \in \Omega_k$, we set

$$\widetilde{v}_k(y) = \frac{v_k(y) - v_k(0)}{|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(0)|}.$$

It follows from (4.1) and (4.7) that

$$v_k(y)|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(y)| \leq (1 + o(1))\frac{v_k(0)|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(0)|}{d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(y, \widetilde{S}_k)}, \quad y \in \Omega_k \setminus \widetilde{S}_k.$$

This together with (4.14) gives

$$|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widetilde{v}_k(y)| \leq \frac{1 + o(1)}{d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(y, \mathcal{S})}, \tag{4.15}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ locally uniformly in $y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}$. Since $\widetilde{v}_k(0) = 0$, it follows from (4.15) that $\widetilde{v}_k$ is uniformly bounded in $C^1(A_R)$ for any $R > 0$. In view of (4.5) and (4.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widetilde{v}_k(y) &= -(1 + o(1))\frac{v_k(y)\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(y)}{v_k(0)|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(0)|} \\ &= \frac{1 + o(1)}{v_k(0)|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k(0)|} e^{\psi(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y)} s_k^2 v_k(y) \left\{ \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y, v_k(y)) - \widetilde{\tau}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y) v_k(y) \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

for $y \in \Omega_k$. Similar to (4.10), $s_k^2 v_k^2$ is bounded in $L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for any $p > 1$. In view of (4.8) and (4.13), applying elliptic estimates to the equation (4.16), we have

$$\widetilde{v}_k \to \widetilde{v} \quad \text{in} \quad C^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty, \tag{4.17}$$

where $\widetilde{v}$ satisfies

$$\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widetilde{v} = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}, \quad \widetilde{v}(0) = 0, \quad |\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widetilde{v}(0)| = 1, \tag{4.18}$$

and

$$|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widetilde{v}(y)| \leq \frac{1}{d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(y, \mathcal{S})}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}. \tag{4.19}$$

Let $\hat{y} \in \mathcal{S}$. For any $0 < r < d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\hat{y}, \mathcal{S} \setminus \{\hat{y}\})/2$, since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} v_k \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k dy &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y) s_k^2 \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k y) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_{s_k r}(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k \hat{y})} \widetilde{u}_k(x) \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widetilde{u}_k(x) dx \\ &= -\int_{\phi^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_{s_k r}(\widetilde{y}_k + s_k \hat{y}))} u_k \Delta_g u_k dv_g, \end{aligned}$$

we get by (1.3), (2.4) and (3.2)

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})} v_k \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k dy \right| \leq \int_\Sigma \left(u_k f_k(x, u_k) + \tau_k u_k^2 \right) dv_g \leq C.$$

Similarly we have by (3.1)

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})}|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}v_k|^2dy\leq\int_\Sigma|\nabla_g u_k|^2dv_g\leq C.$$

It then follows that

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})}v_k\partial_\nu v_kd\sigma=\int_{\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})}|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}v_k|^2dy-\int_{\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})}v_k\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}v_kdy=O(1).$$

While (4.14) and (4.17) lead to

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})}v_k\partial_\nu v_kd\sigma=v_k(0)|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}v_k(0)|\left(\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})}\partial_\nu\widetilde{v}d\sigma+o(1)\right).$$

This together with (4.13) gives for any $0<r<d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\hat{y},\mathcal{S}\setminus\{\hat{y}\})/2$

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})}\partial_\nu\widetilde{v}d\sigma=0,$$

which leads to

$$\frac{d}{dr}\left(\frac{1}{2\pi r}\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})}\widetilde{v}d\sigma\right)=\frac{1}{2\pi r}\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})}\partial_\nu\widetilde{v}d\sigma=0.$$

Hence there exists some constant α depending only on $\hat{y}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi r}\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})}\widetilde{v}d\sigma=\alpha,\quad\forall 0<r<d_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\hat{y},\mathcal{S}\setminus\{\hat{y}\})/2.\tag{4.20}$$

Given any $y\in\partial\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})$. (4.20) permits us to take $y^*\in\partial\mathbb{B}_r(\hat{y})$ such that $\widetilde{v}(y^*)=\alpha$. It then follows from (4.19) that $|\widetilde{v}(y)-\alpha|\leq\pi$. This indicates that $\widetilde{v}$ is bounded near $\hat{y}$. Since this is true for all $\hat{y}\in\mathcal{S}$, we conclude that $\widetilde{v}$ is a smooth harmonic function in $\mathbb{R}^2$. By the mean value equality,

$$\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_R(0)}\widetilde{v}d\sigma=0,\quad\forall R>0.$$

This together with (4.19) implies that $\widetilde{v}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Actually we can take $z\in\partial\mathbb{B}_R(0)$ such that $\widetilde{v}_k(z)=0$, in view of (4.19), we then have for all $y\in\partial\mathbb{B}_R(0)$

$$|\widetilde{v}_k(y)|=|\widetilde{v}_k(y)-\widetilde{v}_k(z)|\leq\pi R\sup_{\partial\mathbb{B}_R(0)}|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}\widetilde{v}|\leq 2\pi,$$

provided that $R>2\sup_{\hat{y}\in\mathcal{S}}|\hat{y}|$. Note again that $\widetilde{v}(0)=0$. Applying Liouville's theorem to (4.18), we have $\widetilde{v}\equiv 0$, which contradicts the fact that $|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}\widetilde{v}(0)|=1$. This completes the proof of the proposition. ☐

5. Quantization

In this section we prove quantization results for the equation (1.2). Let $x_1^*,\cdots,x_N^*$ be as in Proposition 3.1. For some $1\leq i\leq N$, x_i^* is called a *simple* blow-up point if $N=1$ or $x_j\neq x_i$ for all $j\in\{1,\cdots,N\}\setminus\{i\}$; Otherwise we call x_i^* a *complicated* blow-up point. In the following we distinguish these two types of points to proceed.

5.1. Quantization for simple blow-up points

Let x_i^* be a simple blow-up point. Take an isothermal coordinate system $(U_i, \phi_i; \{x^1, x^2\})$ near x_i^*, where $U_i \subset \Sigma$ is a neighborhood of x_i^* such that $x_j^* \notin \overline{U_i}$, the closure of U_i, for all $j \in \{1, \cdots, N\} \setminus \{i\}$. As before $\phi_i : U_i \to \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a diffeomorphism with $\phi_i(x_i^*) = (0, 0)$. Particularly we can find some $\delta > 0$ such that $\mathbb{B}_{2\delta}(0) \subset \Omega$. In this coordinate system, the Riemannian metric $g = e^{\psi_i}(dx^{1^2} + dx_2{}^2)$ for some smooth function $\psi_i : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\psi_i(0, 0) = 0$. In this subsection we prove the following quantization result.

Proposition 5.1 *Let u_k, u_∞, τ_k, τ_∞, $x_{i,k}$ and x_i^* be as in Proposition 3.1. Suppose that x_i^* is a simple blow-up point. Then up to a subsequence, there exists some positive integer $I^{(i)}$ such that*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{U_i} (|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2) dv_g = \int_{U_i} (|\nabla_g u_\infty|^2 + \tau_\infty u_\infty^2) dv_g + 4\pi I^{(i)}, \tag{5.1}$$

where U_i is a neighborhood of x_i^* as above.

In the coordinate system $(U_i, \phi_i; \{x^1, x^2\})$, we write $\widetilde{x}_{i,k} = \phi_i^{-1}(x_{i,k})$, $\widetilde{u}_k(x) = u_k(\phi_i^{-1}(x))$, $\widetilde{\tau}_k(x) = \tau_k(\phi_i^{-1}(x))$ and $\widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k(x)) = f_k(\phi_i^{-1}(x), u_k(\phi_i^{-1}(x)))$ for any $x \in \Omega$. Moreover for $0 < s < t < \delta$ we define the spherical mean of $\widetilde{u}_k$, the total energy and the neck energy of $\widetilde{u}_k$ around $\widetilde{x}_{i,k}$ by

$$\varphi_k(t) = \varphi_k^{(i)}(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi t} \int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k d\sigma, \tag{5.2}$$

$$\Lambda_k(t) = \Lambda_k^{(i)}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) dx, \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$N_k(s, t) = N_k^{(i)}(s, t) = \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}) \setminus \mathbb{B}_s(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) dx \tag{5.4}$$

respectively. We say that the property $(\mathcal{H}_\ell)$ holds if there exist sequences

$$s_k^{(0)} = 0 < r_k^{(1)} < s_k^{(1)} < \cdots < r_k^{(\ell)} < s_k^{(\ell)} = o(1)$$

such that the following hypotheses are satisfied:

$(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,1})$ $\lim_{k\to\infty} r_k^{(j)}/s_k^{(j)} = \lim_{k\to\infty} s_k^{(j-1)}/r_k^{(j)} = 0$ for all $1 \le j \le \ell$;
$(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,2})$ $\lim_{k\to\infty} \varphi_k(s_k^{(j)})/\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(j)}) = 0$ for all $1 \le j \le \ell$ and all $L > 0$;
$(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,3})$ $\lim_{k\to\infty} \Lambda_k(s_k^{(j)}) = 4\pi j$ for all $1 \le j \le \ell$;
$(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,4})$ $\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \left(N_k(s_k^{(j-1)}, r_k^{(j)}/L) + N_k(Lr_k^{(j)}, s_k^{(j)})\right) = 0$ for all $1 \le j \le \ell$.

To prove Proposition 5.1, we follow the lines of [8, 10, 13]. Precisely we use induction as follows: $(\mathcal{H}_1)$ holds; If $(\mathcal{H}_\ell)$ holds, then either $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell+1})$ holds, or

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, \delta/L) = 0. \tag{5.5}$$

In view of (5.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_k(s_k^{(\ell)}) &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_{s_k^{(\ell)}}(\widetilde{x_{i,k}})} \widetilde{u}_k(x)\widetilde{f_k}(x,\widetilde{u}_k(x))dx \\ &= (1+o(1))\int_{\mathbb{B}_{s_k^{(\ell)}}(\widetilde{x_{i,k}})} \widetilde{u}_k(x)\widetilde{f_k}(x,\widetilde{u}_k(x))e^{\psi_i(x)}dx \\ &= (1+o(1))\int_{\phi_i^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_{s_k^{(\ell)}}(\widetilde{x_{i,k}}))} u_k f_k(x,u_k)dv_g \\ &\leq (1+o(1))\int_\Sigma u_k f_k(x,u_k)dv_g.\end{aligned}$$

This together with (2.4) and $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,3})$ implies that the induction terminates after finite steps. Letting ℓ_0 be the largest integer such that $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell_0})$ holds. Since $\widetilde{x_{i,k}} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, in view of the last assertion of Proposition 3.1, there holds for any fixed $L > 2/\delta$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|\widetilde{u}_k - \widetilde{u}_\infty\|_{C^1(\Omega\setminus\mathbb{B}_{\delta/L}(\widetilde{x_{i,k}}))} = 0. \tag{5.6}$$

Moreover it follows from $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell_0,3})$ and (5.5) (with ℓ replaced by ℓ_0) that

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\phi_i^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_{\delta/L}(\widetilde{x_{i,k}}))} u_k f_k(x,u_k)dv_g = \lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{B}_{\delta/L}(\widetilde{x_{i,k}})} \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{f_k}(x,\widetilde{u}_k)dx = 4\pi\ell_0. \tag{5.7}$$

Recalling the equation (1.2), we obtain (5.1) by combining (5.6) and (5.7) with $I^{(i)} = \ell_0$, and thus complete the proof of Proposition 5.1.

The proof of the above induction process will be divided into two steps below.

Step 1. The property $(\mathcal{H}_1)$ *holds.*

For any function $h : \Omega = \phi_i(U_i) \to \mathbb{R}$, denote the spherical mean of h around $\widetilde{x_{i,k}}$ by

$$\overline{h}(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi r}\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_r(\widetilde{x_{i,k}})} h d\sigma, \quad \forall 0 < r < \delta.$$

Let w_k be the unscaled function with respect to the blow-up sequence $\eta_{i,k}$ as in (3.4), namely

$$w_k(x) = u_k(x_{i,k})(\widetilde{u}_k(x) - u_k(x_{i,k})), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

The decay estimate on $\overline{w}_k$ near the point $\widetilde{x_{i,k}}$ is crucial for the property $(\mathcal{H}_1)$. Precisely we have the following result.

Lemma 5.2 *Given* $0 < \epsilon < 1$. *Let* T_k *be the smallest number such that* $\varphi_k(T_k) = \epsilon u_k(x_{i,k})$. *Then* $r_{i,k}/T_k \to 0$ *as* $k \to \infty$, *where* $r_{i,k}$ *is as in (3.3). Moreover, for any* $b < 2$, *there exist some integer* k_0 *and a constant* C *such that when* $k \geq k_0$, *we have*

$$\overline{w}_k(r) \leq b\log\frac{r_{i,k}}{r} + C \tag{5.8}$$

for all $0 \le r \le T_k$ *and*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \Lambda_k(T_k) = 4\pi. \tag{5.9}$$

Proof. It follows from Proposition 3.1 and the definition of T_k that $r_{i,k} = o(T_k)$ as $k \to \infty$. In view of (1.2), $\widetilde{u}_k$ satisfies the equation

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\widetilde{u}_k = e^{\psi_i}(\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k) - \widetilde{\tau}_k\widetilde{u}_k) \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega. \tag{5.10}$$

Let (v_k) be a sequence of solutions to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k = e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k) & \text{on} \quad \mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}) \\ v_k = \widetilde{u}_k & \text{on} \quad \partial\mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}). \end{cases} \tag{5.11}$$

Then we have by (5.10)

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}(v_k - \widetilde{u}_k) = e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{\tau}_k\widetilde{u}_k & \text{on} \quad \mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}) \\ v_k - \widetilde{u}_k = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}). \end{cases} \tag{5.12}$$

Applying elliptic estimates to (5.12), we can find some constant C independent of k such that

$$|v_k(x) - \widetilde{u}_k(x)| \le C \ \text{ for all } \ x \in \mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}).$$

Moreover, it follows from Proposition 4.1 that

$$\inf_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k \ge \varphi_k(T_k) - C \tag{5.13}$$

for some constant C depending only on the Riemannian metric g. Applying the maximum principle to (5.11), we have by (5.13)

$$\widetilde{u}_k(x) \ge \varphi_k(T_k) - C \ \text{ for all } \ x \in \mathbb{B}_{T_k}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}). \tag{5.14}$$

Note that $\varphi_k(T_k) = \epsilon u_k(x_{i,k})$. For any $0 \le t \le T_k$, we have by (5.14) and the fact that $u_k \to u_\infty$ strongly in $L^2(\Sigma)$

$$u_k(x_{i,k})\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{\tau}_k\widetilde{u}_k dx \le \frac{\|\tau_k\|_{L^\infty(\Sigma)}}{\epsilon}\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i}\left(\widetilde{u}_k^2 + C\widetilde{u}_k\right) dx = o(1). \tag{5.15}$$

For any $Lr_{i,k} \le t \le T_k$, we obtain by Proposition 3.1

$$\begin{aligned} -u_k(x_{i,k})\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k)dx &\le -u_k(x_{i,k})\int_{\mathbb{B}_{Lr_{i,k}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k)dx \\ &= -r_{i,k}^{-2}\int_{\mathbb{B}_{Lr_{i,k}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i}\frac{\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k)}{f_k(x_{i,k},u_k(x_{i,k}))}dx \\ &= -(1+o(1))\int_{\mathbb{B}_L(0)} e^{(2+o(1))\eta_\infty}dx \\ &= -4\pi + o(1), \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ first, and then $L \to \infty$. In view of (5.10), $\overline{w}_k$ satisfies

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\overline{w}_k = u_k(x_{i,k})\overline{e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{f_k}(x,\widetilde{u}_k)} - u_k(x_{i,k})\overline{e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{\tau}_k\widetilde{u}_k}.$$

Then we have for any $Lr_{i,k} \le t \le T_k$

$$\begin{aligned}
2\pi t\overline{w}_k'(t) &= \int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \partial_\nu \overline{w}_k d\sigma = \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\overline{w}_k dx \\
&= -u_k(x_{i,k})\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \overline{e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{f_k}(x,\widetilde{u}_k)}dx + u_k(x_{i,k})\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \overline{e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{\tau}_k\widetilde{u}_k}dx \\
&= -u_k(x_{i,k})\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{f_k}(x,\widetilde{u}_k)dx + u_k(x_{i,k})\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{\tau}_k\widetilde{u}_k dx \\
&\le -4\pi + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used (5.15) and (5.16) in the last inequality. Thus for any $b < 2$, there exists some integer k_0 such that

$$\overline{w}_k'(t) \le -\frac{b}{t} \quad \text{for all} \quad k \ge k_0.$$

This together with Proposition 3.1 leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{w}_k(t) &\le \overline{w}_k(Lr_{i,k}) - b\log\frac{t}{Lr_{i,k}} \\
&\le \log\frac{1}{1+L^2} - b\log\frac{t}{Lr_{i,k}} + o(1) \\
&\le b\log\frac{r_{i,k}}{t} + C
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant C, all $k \ge k_0$, and all $Lr_{i,j} \le t \le T_k$. It follows from Proposition 3.1 again that the above inequality also holds for $0 \le t \le Lr_{i,k}$. Hence (5.8) holds.

By (5.8) and (5.14) we have

$$(\epsilon - 1)u_k^2(x_{i,k}) - Cu_k(x_{i,k}) \le \overline{w}_k(r) \le C, \quad \forall r \in [Lr_{i,k}, T_k].$$

Hence there holds for $Lr_{i,k} \le r \le T_k$

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_k^2(r) - u_k^2(x_{i,k}) &= \left(1 + \frac{\varphi_k(r)}{u_k(x_{i,k})}\right)\overline{w}_k(r) \\
&= \left(2 + \frac{\overline{w}_k}{u_k^2(x_{i,k})}\right)\overline{w}_k(r) \\
&\le (1 + \epsilon + o(1))\overline{w}_k(r) + (1 - \epsilon + o(1))C \\
&\le (1 + 2\epsilon/3)b\log\frac{r_{i,k}}{r} + C, \qquad (5.17)
\end{aligned}$$

provided that k is sufficiently large. For $0 < r < \delta$ we denote

$$\theta_k(r) = \theta_k^{(i)}(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi r}\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_r(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{f_k}(x, \varphi_k(r))d\sigma. \qquad (5.18)$$

Taking b such that $(1+2\epsilon/3)b = 2+\epsilon$ in (5.17) and recalling (H4) and (H5), we can find some constant C such that for $Lr_{i,k} \leq r \leq T_k$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\theta_k(r)}{f_k(x_{i,k}, u_k(x_{i,k}))} &= \frac{\theta_k(r)}{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}, \varphi_k(r))} \frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}, \varphi_k(r))}{f_k(x_{i,k}, u_k(x_{i,k}))} \\
&= (1+o(1)) \frac{f_k(x_{i,k}, \varphi_k(r))}{f_k(x_{i,k}, u_k(x_{i,k}))} \\
&= (1+o(1)) e^{(1+o(1))(\varphi_k^2(r) - u_k^2(x_{i,k}))} \\
&\leq C \left(\frac{r_{i,k}}{r} \right)^{2+\epsilon} \qquad (5.19)
\end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large k. For $0 < s < t < \delta$, we define an analogy of (5.4) as below.

$$\overline{N}_k(s,t) = \overline{N}_k^{(i)}(s,t) = 2\pi \int_s^t r \varphi_k(r) \theta_k(r) dr. \qquad (5.20)$$

In view of (5.8) and (5.19), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{N}_k(Lr_{i,k}, T_k) &= 2\pi \int_{Lr_{i,k}}^{T_k} r \varphi_k(r) \theta_k(r) dr \\
&= 2\pi r_{i,k}^{-2} \int_{Lr_{i,k}}^{T_k} r \frac{\varphi_k(r)}{u_k(x_{i,k})} \frac{\theta_k(r)}{f_k(x_{i,k}, u_k(x_{i,k}))} dr \\
&\leq 2\pi (1+o(1)) C r_{i,k}^{\epsilon} \int_{Lr_{i,k}}^{T_k} \frac{1}{r^{1+\epsilon}} dr \\
&\leq 2\pi (1+o(1)) C \epsilon^{-1} L^{-\epsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(Lr_{i,k}, T_k) = 0. \qquad (5.21)$$

Since Proposition 4.1 implies that

$$u_k^2(x) - \varphi_k^2(r) \leq C \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in \partial\mathbb{B}_r(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}),$$

there holds

$$N_k(Lr_{i,k}, T_k) \leq C \overline{N}_k(Lr_{i,k}, T_k) + o(1).$$

This together with (5.21) leads to

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(Lr_{i,k}, T_k) = 0. \qquad (5.22)$$

By Proposition 3.1,

$$\Lambda_k(Lr_{i,k}) = \int_{\mathbb{B}_{Lr_{i,k}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k) dx = (1+o(1)) \int_{\mathbb{B}_L(0)} e^{2\eta_\infty} dx.$$

Hence

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \Lambda_k(Lr_{i,k}) = 4\pi. \qquad (5.23)$$

Thus (5.9) follows from (5.22) and (5.23) immediately. $\square$

By Lemma 5.2 we may choose a subsequence u_k, numbers $\epsilon_k \searrow 0$ as $k \to \infty$ and $s_k = T_k(\epsilon_k)$ with $r_{i,k}/s_k \to 0$, $\varphi_k(s_k) \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$ and such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \Lambda_k(s_k) = 4\pi, \quad \lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(Lr_{i,k}, s_k) = 0,$$

while in addition

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\varphi_k(s_k)}{\varphi_k(Lr_{i,k})} = 0, \quad \forall\, L > 0.$$

Let $r_k^{(1)} = r_{i,k}$, $s_k^{(1)} = s_k$. Then $(\mathcal{H}_1)$ holds and Step 1 is finished.

Step 2. Suppose that $(\mathcal{H}_\ell)$ *already holds for some integer* $\ell \geq 1$, *namely there exist sequences* $s_k^{(0)} = 0 < r_k^{(1)} < s_k^{(1)} < \cdots < r_k^{(\ell)} < s_k^{(\ell)} = o(1)$ *such that* $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,1})$ *up to* $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,4})$ *hold. Then we shall prove that either* $\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, \delta/L) = 0$ *or* $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell+1})$ *holds.*

Setting

$$P_k(t) = P_k^{(i)}(t) = t\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_t} \widetilde{u}_k \widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k)d\sigma, \quad \overline{P}_k(t) = \overline{P}_k^{(i)}(t) = 2\pi t^2\varphi_k(t)\theta_k(t) \tag{5.24}$$

and assuming $(\mathcal{H}_\ell)$ holds, we have the following result.

Lemma 5.3 *There exists a constant* C_0 *depending only on the upper bound of the total energy (2.4) and the Riemannian metric* g *such that for* $s_k^{(\ell)} \leq t_k = o(1)$, *there holds*

$$\overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k) \leq \overline{P}_k(t_k) + C_0\overline{N}_k^2(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k) + o(1), \tag{5.25}$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ *as* $k \to \infty$, $\overline{N}_k$ *and* $\overline{P}_k$ *are as defined in (5.20) and (5.24) respectively.*

Proof. We first claim that there exists a constant C depending only on δ and the Riemannian metric g such that

$$\varphi_k(s) \leq \sup_{\partial\mathbb{B}_s(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k \leq \inf_{\partial\mathbb{B}_r(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k + C \leq \varphi_k(r) + C \ \text{ for all } \ 0 < r < s \leq \delta. \tag{5.26}$$

Here and in the sequel we denote different constants by the same C. To see this, we set v_k be a positive solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} v_k = e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k) & \text{in} \quad \mathbb{B}_\delta(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}) \\ v_k = \widetilde{u}_k & \text{on} \quad \partial\mathbb{B}_\delta(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}). \end{cases} \tag{5.27}$$

Thus we have by (1.2)

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}(v_k - \widetilde{u}_k) = e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{\tau}_k\widetilde{u}_k & \text{in} \quad \mathbb{B}_\delta(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}) \\ v_k - \widetilde{u}_k = 0 & \text{on} \quad \partial\mathbb{B}_\delta(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}). \end{cases} \tag{5.28}$$

Noting that $\|e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{\tau}_k\widetilde{u}_k\|_{L^p(\mathbb{B}_\delta(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}))}$ is bounded for any $p > 1$ and applying elliptic estimates to (5.28), we then find some constant $C = C(\delta)$ such that

$$v_k(x) - C \leq \widetilde{u}_k(x) \leq v_k(x) + C \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in \mathbb{B}_\delta(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}). \tag{5.29}$$

By (5.27), we have for $0 < r < \delta$

$$-(r\overline{v}_k'(r))' = r\,\overline{e^{\psi_i}\,\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k)}.$$

Integration from 0 to r gives

$$-r\overline{v}_k'(r) = \int_0^r r\,\overline{e^{\psi_i}\,\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k)}dr.$$

Hence

$$\overline{v}_k'(r) \le 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 < r < \delta. \tag{5.30}$$

Now fix $0 < r < s \le \delta$. There exist two points $\xi \in \partial\mathbb{B}_r(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})$ and $\zeta \in \partial\mathbb{B}_s(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})$ such that

$$v_k(\xi) = \overline{v}_k(r), \quad v_k(\zeta) = \overline{v}_k(s).$$

This together with the gradient estimate (Proposition 4.1), (5.29), and (5.30) leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{\partial\mathbb{B}_s(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k &\le \widetilde{u}_k(\zeta) + C \le v_k(\zeta) + C \\ &\le v_k(\xi) + C \le \inf_{\partial\mathbb{B}_r(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k + C.\end{aligned}$$

This confirms our claim (5.26).

Next we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_k'(r) &= \frac{d}{dr}\left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \widetilde{f}_k\left(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}^1 + r\cos\theta, \widetilde{x}_{i,k}^2 + r\sin\theta, \varphi_k(r)\right)d\theta\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \nabla_x \widetilde{f}_k\left(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}^1 + r\cos\theta, \widetilde{x}_{i,k}^2 + r\sin\theta, \varphi_k(r)\right)\cdot(\cos\theta,\sin\theta)d\theta \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \widetilde{f}_k'\left(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}^1 + r\cos\theta, \widetilde{x}_{i,k}^2 + r\sin\theta, \varphi_k(r)\right)\varphi_k'(r)d\theta,\end{aligned}$$

where we write $\widetilde{x}_{i,k} = (\widetilde{x}_{i,k}^1, \widetilde{x}_{i,k}^2)$. In view of (H4), we obtain

$$|\theta_k'(r)| \le C\left(1 + \theta_k(r) + \varphi_k(r)|\varphi_k'(r)|\theta_k(r)\right) \tag{5.31}$$

For $s = s_k^{(\ell)} \le t \le t_k$, we have by the equation (1.2)

$$\begin{aligned}-2\pi t\varphi_k'(t) &= -\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \partial_\nu \varphi_k d\sigma = -\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\varphi_k dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \overline{e^{\psi_i}\,\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k)}dx - \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \overline{e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{\tau}_k\widetilde{u}_k}dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i}\,\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k)dx - \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{\tau}_k\widetilde{u}_k dx.\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (H4), (H5) and Proposition 4.1 that $\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k) \le C(1 + \widetilde{f}_k(x,\varphi_k(r))) \le C(1+\theta_k(r))$, where $r = |x - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}|$. Combining (H4), (H5) and (5.26), we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_s(\widetilde{x}_k)} \varphi_k(s)\theta_k(r)dx \le C(1 + \Lambda_k(s)),$$

where the integrand $\varphi_k(s)\theta_k(r) = \varphi_k(s)\theta_k(|x - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}|)$. Note that $\varphi_k(s) \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
-2\pi t\varphi_k'(t) &\leq C\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} (1 + \theta_k(r))\,dx \\
&\leq C\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})\setminus\mathbb{B}_s(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \theta_k(r)dx + \frac{C}{\varphi_k(s)}\int_{\mathbb{B}_s(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(s)\theta_k(r)dx + o(1) \\
&\leq C\overline{N}_k(s,t) + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

This immediately leads to

$$-\pi\int_s^t r^2\varphi_k'(r)\theta_k(r)dr \leq C\overline{N}_k^2(s,t) + o(1). \tag{5.32}$$

Similarly we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-2\pi t\varphi_k(t)\varphi_k'(t) &= -\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t)\partial_\nu\varphi_k d\sigma = -\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t)\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\varphi_k dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t)\overline{e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k)}dx - \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t)\overline{e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{\tau}_k\widetilde{u}_k}dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t)\overline{e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k)}dx + o(1),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.33}$$

the last equality follows from (5.26) and $u_k \to u_\infty$ strongly in $L^2(\Sigma)$. Repeatedly using (5.26), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t)\overline{e^{\psi_i}\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k)}dx &\leq C\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(t)\,(1 + \theta_k(r))\,dx \\
&\leq C\int_{\mathbb{B}_t(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})\setminus\mathbb{B}_s(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} (1 + \varphi_k(r))\,(1 + \theta_k(r))\,dx \\
&\quad +C\int_{\mathbb{B}_s(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})\setminus\mathbb{B}_{Lr_k^{(\ell)}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} (1 + \varphi_k(r))\,(1 + \theta_k(r))\,dx \\
&\quad +C\int_{\mathbb{B}_{Lr_k^{(\ell)}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} (1 + \varphi_k(s))\,(1 + \theta_k(r))\,dx \\
&\leq C\left(\overline{N}_k(s,t) + \overline{N}_k(Lr_k^{(\ell)}, s) + \frac{\varphi_k(s)}{\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(\ell)})}\left(\Lambda_k(Lr_k^{(\ell)}) + o(1)\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This together with (5.33), $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,2})$ and $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,4})$ implies

$$2\pi t\varphi_k(t)|\varphi_k'(t)| \leq C\overline{N}_k(s,t) + o(1). \tag{5.34}$$

Obviously

$$\int_s^t r^2\varphi_k(r)dr = o(1), \qquad \int_s^t r^2\varphi_k(r)\theta_k(r)dr = o(1).$$

It then follows from (5.31) and (5.34) that

$$\begin{aligned}
-\pi\int_s^t r^2\varphi_k(r)\theta_k'(r)dr &\leq \pi C\int_s^t r^2\varphi_k^2(r)|\varphi_k'(r)|\theta_k(r)dr + o(1) \\
&\leq C\overline{N}_k^2(s,t) + o(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.35}$$

Integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{N}_k(s,t) &= \int_s^t 2\pi r\varphi_k(r)\theta_k(r)dr \\ &\leq \pi t^2\varphi_k(t)\theta_k(t) - \pi\int_s^t r^2\varphi_k'(r)\theta_k(r)dr - \pi\int_s^t r^2\varphi_k(r)\theta_k'(r)dr.\end{aligned}$$

This together with (5.32) and (5.35) implies (5.25). □

Lemma 5.4 *Let C_0 be the constant as in Lemma 5.3. Let t_k be such that for a subsequence*

$$s_k^{(\ell)} < t_k = o(1), \quad 0 < \lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k) = \alpha < \frac{1}{2C_0}.$$

Then $s_k^{(\ell)} = o(t_k)$ as $k \to \infty$, $\liminf_{k\to\infty} \overline{P}_k(t_k) \geq \alpha/2$, and

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k/L) = 0, \tag{5.36}$$

where $\overline{N}_k$ and $\overline{P}_k$ are as defined in (5.20) and (5.24) respectively.

Proof. We first claim that

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, Ls_k^{(\ell)}) = 0. \tag{5.37}$$

Actually, in view of (5.26), we have for $0 < t \leq t_k$

$$\overline{P}_k(t) \leq C\overline{N}_k(t/2, t) + o(1) \leq C\overline{P}_k(t/2) + o(1), \tag{5.38}$$

and

$$\overline{N}_k(t, 2t) \leq C\overline{N}_k(t/2, t) + o(1).$$

Particularly for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(2^{j-1}s_k^{(\ell)}, 2^j s_k^{(\ell)}) &\leq C\lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(2^{j-2}s_k^{(\ell)}, 2^{j-1}s_k^{(\ell)}) \\ &\leq C^j \lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}/2, s_k^{(\ell)}) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

If $L \leq 2^j$, we obtain

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, Ls_k^{(\ell)}) \leq \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{m=1}^{j} \overline{N}_k(2^{m-1}s_k^{(\ell)}, 2^m s_k^{(\ell)}) = 0.$$

Thus our claim (5.37) follows immediately. One can see from (5.37) that $s_k^{(\ell)}/t_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. By Lemma 5.3,

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \overline{P}_k(t_k) \geq \frac{1}{2}\lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k) = \frac{\alpha}{2}. \tag{5.39}$$

Now we show (5.36). Suppose not, there holds

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k/L) = \beta > 0.$$

Then we have for any fixed $L \geq 1$ and all sufficiently large k

$$\frac{\beta}{2} \leq \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k/L) \leq \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k) < \frac{1}{2C_0}.$$

Applying (5.25) with t_k/L instead of t_k, we get

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{P}_k(t_k/L) \geq \frac{\beta}{4},$$

and then by (5.38)

$$C \lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k\,(t_k/(2L), t_k/L) \geq \lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{P}_k(t_k/L) \geq \frac{\beta}{4}.$$

Choosing $L = 2^m$, $m = 0, 1, \cdots, j-1$, we have

$$\frac{j\beta}{4} \leq C \lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(2^{-j}t_k, t_k) \leq C(1 + \limsup_{k\to\infty} \Lambda_k(t_k)) \leq C.$$

We get a contradiction by letting $j \to \infty$ and obtain (5.36). □

Lemma 5.5 *Suppose that*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \sup_{s_k^{(\ell)}<t<t_k} \overline{P}_k(t) = 0 \quad \text{for any sequence } t_k \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty. \tag{5.40}$$

Then we have

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, \delta/L) = 0.$$

Proof. In view of Lemma 5.4, it suffices to prove

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \sup_{s_k^{(\ell)}<t<\delta/L} \overline{P}_k(t) = 0. \tag{5.41}$$

Indeed, if we take some number $t_{k,L} \in (s_k^{(\ell)}, \delta/L)$ such that

$$\overline{P}_k(t_{k,L}) = \sup_{s_k^{(\ell)}<t<\delta/L} \overline{P}_k(t),$$

then either

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} t_{k,L} = 0, \tag{5.42}$$

or

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} t_{k,L} = t_L^* > 0. \tag{5.43}$$

In the case of (5.42), we already have (5.41) because of (5.40). While in the case of (5.43), we have by using (5.26)

$$\overline{P}_k(t_{k,L}) \leq Ct_{k,L}^2\,(1 + \varphi_k(t_L^*/2)\theta_k(t_L^*/2)) \tag{5.44}$$

for sufficiently large k. Note that $\partial\mathbb{B}_{t_L^*/2}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}) \subset \mathbb{B}_{t_L^*}(\widetilde{x}_i^*) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{t_L^*/3}(\widetilde{x}_i^*)$ for sufficiently large k, and that $t_{k,L} \leq \delta/L \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ first and then $L \to \infty$. Moreover, by Proposition 3.1, we have $u_k \to u_\infty$

in $C^1_{\rm loc}(\Sigma \setminus \cup_{j=1}^N \{x_j^*\}, \mathbb{R})$ and $u_\infty \in C^1(\Sigma, \mathbb{R})$, particularly u_∞ is bounded on $\mathbb{B}_\delta(x_i^*)$. It then follows from (5.44) that

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{P}_k(t_{k,L}) = 0.$$

Thus (5.41) holds again. □

If the assumption (5.40) is not satisfied, then (5.38) implies that there exists a sequence $t_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k) > 0. \tag{5.45}$$

We shall show that the property $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell+1})$ holds. Take $r_k^{(\ell+1)} \in (s_k^{(\ell)}, t_k)$ such that up to a subsequence, there holds

$$0 < \lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, r_k^{(\ell+1)}) < \frac{1}{2C_0},$$

where C_0 is as in Lemma 5.3. It then follows from Lemma 5.4 that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{s_k^{(\ell)}}{r_k^{(\ell+1)}} = 0, \quad \lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, r_k^{(\ell+1)}) > 0, \tag{5.46}$$

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \overline{P}_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)}) > 0, \quad \lim_{k\to\infty} \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)}) = \infty, \tag{5.47}$$

and that

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} \overline{N}_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, r_k^{(\ell+1)}/L) = 0. \tag{5.48}$$

Moreover, we have the following result.

Lemma 5.6 *Up to a subsequence there holds*

$$\eta_k^{(\ell+1)}(x) := \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)})\left(\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k^{(\ell+1)}x) - \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)})\right) \to \eta^{(\ell+1)}(x)$$

in $C^1_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\})$ *as* $k \to \infty$, *where*

$$\eta^{(\ell+1)}(x) = \log \frac{2}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}(1+|x|^2)}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta^{(\ell+1)}} dx = \frac{4\pi}{\alpha_0}$$

for some constant $\alpha_0 > 0$.

Proof. To simplify the notations we write $r_k = r_k^{(\ell+1)}$, $\eta_k = \eta_k^{(\ell+1)}$, and $\eta = \eta^{(\ell+1)}$. For any fixed $L > 0$, we set

$$v_k(x) = \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x), \quad x \in \mathbb{B}_L(0) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0). \tag{5.49}$$

In view of Proposition 4.1, there exists some constant $C = C(L)$ such that

$$|\widetilde{u}_k^2(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x) - \varphi_k^2(r_k)| \leq C,$$

and thus

$$|\varphi_k(r_k)\left(\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x) - \varphi_k(r_k)\right)| \leq C. \tag{5.50}$$

Hence

$$\eta_k \quad \text{is bounded in} \quad L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}). \tag{5.51}$$

Combining (5.47) and (5.50), we have

$$v_k - \varphi_k(r_k) \to 0 \quad \text{in} \quad L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty,$$

in particular

$$\frac{v_k}{\varphi_k(r_k)} \to 1 \quad \text{in} \quad L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \tag{5.52}$$

By the equation (1.2), we write for $x \in \Omega_k = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x \in \mathbb{B}_\delta(0)\}$

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta_k(x) = e^{\psi_i(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+r_kx)}\varphi_k(r_k)r_k^2\widetilde{f}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+r_kx, v_k(x)) - e^{\psi_i(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+r_kx)}\varphi_k(r_k)r_k^2\widetilde{\tau}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+r_kx)v_k(x). \tag{5.53}$$

Since $u_k \to u_\infty$ strongly in $L^2(\Sigma)$, we have by using (5.52)

$$\begin{aligned} r_k^2\varphi_k^2(r_k) &= \frac{r_k^2}{3\pi}\int_{\mathbb{B}_2(0)\setminus\mathbb{B}_1(0)} \varphi_k^2(r_k)dx \\ &= (1+o(1))\frac{r_k^2}{3\pi}\int_{\mathbb{B}_2(0)\setminus\mathbb{B}_1(0)} v_k^2(x)dx \\ &= \frac{1+o(1)}{3\pi}\int_{\mathbb{B}_{2r_k}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})\setminus\mathbb{B}_{r_k}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k^2(y)dy \\ &\to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{5.54}$$

By (5.47) we may assume

$$r_k^2\varphi_k^2(r_k)\theta_k(r_k) \to \alpha_0 > 0. \tag{5.55}$$

Moreover, by (H4) and (H5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+r_kx, v_k(x))}{\theta_k(r_k)} &= (1+o(1))\frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+r_kx, v_k(x))}{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+r_kx, \varphi_k(r_k))} \\ &= (1+o(1))e^{(1+o(1))(v_k^2(x)-\varphi_{i,k}^2(r_k))} \\ &= (1+o(1))e^{(2+o(1))\eta_k(x)}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.56}$$

Applying elliptic estimates to (5.53), we conclude from (5.51), (5.54)-(5.56) that

$$\eta_k \to \eta \quad \text{in} \quad C^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty, \tag{5.57}$$

where η satisfies

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta = \alpha_0 e^{2\eta} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}. \tag{5.58}$$

For any $L > 0$, (5.57) together with (2.4), (5.52) and (5.55) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}_L(0)\setminus\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} e^{2\eta}dx &= \lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{B}_L(0)\setminus\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} e^{2\eta_k}dx \\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{B}_L(0)\setminus\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \frac{v_k(x)\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+r_kx, v_k(x))}{\varphi_k(r_k)\theta_k(r_k)}dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha_0}\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{B}_{Lr_k}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})\setminus\mathbb{B}_{r_k/L}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k(y)\widetilde{f}_k(y, \widetilde{u}_k(y))dy \\ &\le \frac{C}{\alpha_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $L \to \infty$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta} dx < \infty.$$

It follows from (5.26), $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,2})$ and $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell,4})$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{B}_{s_k^{(\ell)}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(r_k)\widetilde{f}_k(y,\widetilde{u}_k(y))dy \quad &\leq \quad \int_{\mathbb{B}_{s_k^{(\ell)}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{Lr_k^{(\ell)}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(r)\widetilde{f}_k(y,\widetilde{u}_k(y))dy \\
&\qquad + \frac{\varphi_k(s_k^{(\ell)})}{\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(\ell)})} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{Lr_k^{(\ell)}}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(r)\widetilde{f}_k(y,\widetilde{u}_k(y))dy + o(1) \\
&\leq \quad N_k(Lr_k^{(\ell)}, s_k^{(\ell)}) + \frac{\varphi_k(s_k^{(\ell)})}{\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(\ell)})} \Lambda_k(Lr_k^{(\ell)}) + o(1) \\
&\to \quad 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $k \to \infty$ first then $L \to \infty$, that

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_{r_k/L}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(r_k)\widetilde{f}_k(y,\widetilde{u}_k(y))dy \leq N_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, r_k/L) + o(1) \to 0$$

as $k \to \infty$ first, then $L \to \infty$, and that

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_{r_k/L}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \varphi_k(r_k)\widetilde{u}_k(y)dy \leq \int_{\mathbb{B}_{r_k/L}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k})} \widetilde{u}_k^2(y)dy + o(1) \to 0$$

as $k \to \infty$. Therefore we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{L\to\infty} \limsup_{k\to\infty} \left| \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} -\Delta\eta_k dx \right| \quad &\leq \quad \lim_{L\to\infty} \limsup_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{r_k/L}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}))} \varphi_k(r_k)\widetilde{f}_k(y,\widetilde{u}_k(y))dy \\
&\qquad + \lim_{L\to\infty} \limsup_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{r_k/L}(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}))} \varphi_k(r_k)\widetilde{\tau}_k(y)\widetilde{u}_k(y)dy \\
&= \quad 0. \qquad (5.59)
\end{aligned}$$

Let ζ_k be a sequence of solution to the equation

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\zeta_k(x) = e^{\psi_i(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+r_k x)}\varphi_k(r_k)r_k^2\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x, v_k(x)) \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{B}_1(0) \\ \zeta_k = \eta_k \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\mathbb{B}_1(0). \end{cases} \qquad (5.60)$$

Then in view of (5.53), $\eta_k - \zeta_k$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\eta_k - \zeta_k)(x) = -e^{\psi_i(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+r_k x)}\varphi_k(r_k)r_k^2\widetilde{\tau}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x)v_k(x) \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{B}_1(0) \\ \eta_k - \zeta_k = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\mathbb{B}_1(0). \end{cases} \qquad (5.61)$$

Since u_k is bounded in $L^p(\Sigma)$ for any $p > 1$, applying elliptic estimates to (5.61), we get

$$\|\eta_k - \zeta_k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{B}_1(0))} \leq C$$

for some constant C. By (5.57), η_k is uniformly bounded on $\partial\mathbb{B}_1(0)$. In view of (5.60), the maximum principle implies that there exists some constant C such that

$$\zeta_k(x) \geq -C \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in \mathbb{B}_1(0).$$

Hence

$$\eta_k(x) \geq -C \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in \mathbb{B}_1(0). \tag{5.62}$$

By (5.26), $\varphi_k(r_k) \leq v_k(x) + C$ for all $x \in \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)$ and $L > 1$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_k(r_k) r_k^2 \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x, v_k(x)) &= \varphi_k(r_k) r_k^2 \theta_k(r_k) \frac{\widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x, v_k(x))}{\theta_k(r_k)} \\ &= (\alpha_0 + o(1)) e^{(1+o(1))(v_k^2(x) - \varphi_k^2(r_k))}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.63}$$

Using an inequality $a^2 - b^2 \geq 2b(a-b)$ for all $a \geq 0$ and $b \geq 0$, we get $v_k^2(x) - \varphi_{i,k}^2(r_k) \geq 2\eta_k(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{B}_1(0)$. Then (5.63) leads to

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} e^{\eta_k} dx \leq \frac{2}{\alpha_0} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi_k(r_k) r_k^2 \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x, v_k(x)) dx \tag{5.64}$$

for sufficiently large k. Combining (5.53), (5.59), (5.62) and (5.64), we obtain

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta_k dx = 0. \tag{5.65}$$

For any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta \Delta\varphi dx &= \lim_{L\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta \Delta\varphi dx \\ &= \lim_{L\to\infty} \left(-\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta \partial_\nu \varphi d\sigma + \int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi \partial_\nu \eta d\sigma + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi \Delta\eta dx \right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.66}$$

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta \partial_\nu \varphi d\sigma &= \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta_k \partial_\nu \varphi d\sigma \\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty} \left(\int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta_k \Delta\varphi dx + \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \nabla\eta_k \nabla\varphi dx \right) \\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty} \left(\int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \eta_k \Delta\varphi dx + \int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi \partial_\nu \eta_k d\sigma - \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi \Delta\eta_k dx \right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.67}$$

Moreover, by Proposition 4.1 and (5.26), there exists some constant C such that

$$|\nabla\eta_k(x)| = \varphi_k(r_k) r_k |\nabla u_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + r_k x)| \leq C/|x|$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)$. This together with (5.59) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \varphi \partial_\nu \eta_k d\sigma &= \varphi(0) \lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \partial_\nu \eta_k d\sigma \\ &= \varphi(0) \lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)} \Delta\eta_k dx \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)}\varphi\partial_\nu\eta d\sigma = \lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)}\varphi\partial_\nu\eta_k d\sigma = 0. \tag{5.68}$$

Inserting (5.58), (5.59), (5.65), (5.67) and (5.68) into (5.66), we obtain

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta\Delta\varphi dx = \lim_{L\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2\setminus\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(0)}\alpha_0 e^{2\eta}\varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\alpha_0 e^{2\eta}\varphi dx.$$

Therefore η is a distributional solution to the equation

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta = \alpha_0 e^{2\eta} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2.$$

By the regularity theory for elliptic equations, see for example ([4], Chapter 2), $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. By a result of Chen-Li [5],

$$\eta(x) = \log\frac{2}{1+|x|^2} - \log\sqrt{\alpha_0},$$

and thus

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta}dx = \frac{4\pi}{\alpha_0}.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

It follows from Lemma 5.6 that

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)}/L, Lr_k^{(\ell+1)}) = \alpha_0\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta^{(\ell+1)}}dx = 4\pi.$$

This together with (5.48) gives

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, Lr_k^{(\ell+1)}) = 4\pi.$$

By the inductive hypothesis ($\mathcal{H}_{\ell,3}$),

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\Lambda_k(Lr_k^{(\ell+1)}) &= \lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\left(\Lambda_k(s_k^{(\ell)}) + N_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, Lr_k^{(\ell+1)})\right)\\ &= 4\pi(\ell+1).\end{aligned}$$

Now we set $w_k^{(\ell+1)}(x) = \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)})(\widetilde{u}_k(x) - \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)}))$. Similar to Lemma 5.2, we have

Lemma 5.7 *For any $\epsilon > 0$, let $T_k^{(\ell+1)} = T_k^{(\ell+1)}(\epsilon) > r_k^{(\ell+1)}$ be the minimal number such that $\varphi_k(T_k^{(\ell+1)}) = \epsilon\varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell+1)})$. Then we have $r_k^{(\ell+1)}/T_k^{(\ell+1)} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Moreover, for any $b < 2$ and sufficiently large k, L, there holds*

$$\overline{w_k^{(\ell+1)}}(r) \le b\log\frac{r_k^{(\ell+1)}}{r} + C \quad \text{for all} \quad Lr_k^{(\ell+1)} \le r \le T_k^{(\ell+1)},$$

where C is a constant depending only on α_0 and (Σ, g), and we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell)}, T_k^{(\ell+1)}) = 4\pi.$$

Proof. Since the proof is completely analogous to that of Lemma 4.2, except that instead of Proposition 3.1 we shall use Lemma 5.6 and omit the details here. □

For suitable $s_k^{(\ell+1)} = T_k^{(\ell+1)}(\epsilon_k)$, where $\epsilon_k \searrow 0$ is chosen such that $u_k(s_k^{(\ell+1)}) \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$ and $r_k^{(\ell+1)}/s_k^{(\ell+1)} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Moreover

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \Lambda_k(s_k^{(\ell+1)}) = 4\pi(\ell+1),$$

and

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(Lr_k^{(\ell+1)}, s_k^{(\ell+1)}) = 0.$$

By the definition of $s_k^{(\ell+1)}$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\varphi_k(s_k^{(\ell+1)})}{\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(\ell+1)})} = 0 \quad \text{for any} \quad L > 0.$$

Hence $(\mathcal{H}_{\ell+1})$ holds. This completes Step 2, and thus the proof of Proposition 5.1.

5.2. *Quantization for complicated blow-up points*

In this subsection, we shall prove a quantization result for complicated blow-up points. We assume that x_i^* is a complicated blow-up point of order m, namely there exists a subset $\{i_1, \cdots, i_m\} \subset \{1, \cdots, N\}$ such that $d_g(x_i^*, x_\ell^*) = 0$ for all $\ell \in \{i_1, \cdots, i_m\}$ and $d_g(x_j^*, x_i^*) > 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \cdots, N\} \setminus \{i_1, \cdots, i_m\}$. Particularly we have $i \in \{i_1, \cdots, i_m\}$. Take an isothermal coordinate system $(U, \phi; \{x^1, x^2\})$ near x_i^*, where $U \subset \Sigma$ is a neighborhood of x_i^* such that $x_j^* \notin \overline{U}$, the closure of U for all $j \in \{1, \cdots, N\} \setminus \{i_1, \cdots, i_m\}$, $\phi : U \to \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a diffeomorphism with $\phi(x_i^*) = (0, 0)$. We can find some $\delta > 0$ such that $\mathbb{B}_{2\delta}(0) \subset \Omega$. In this coordinate system, the Riemannian metric $g = e^{\psi}(dx^{1^2} + dx_2{}^2)$ for some smooth function $\psi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\psi(0, 0) = 0$. We prove the following result.

Proposition 5.8 *Let u_k, u_∞, τ_k, τ_∞, $x_{i,k}$ and x_i^* be as in Proposition 3.1. Suppose that x_i^* is a complicated blow-up point of order m as above. Then up to a subsequence, there exists some positive integer I such that*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_U (|\nabla_g u_k|^2 + \tau_k u_k^2) dv_g = \int_U (|\nabla_g u_\infty|^2 + \tau_\infty u_\infty^2) dv_g + 4\pi I, \tag{5.69}$$

where U is a neighborhood of x_i^* chosen as above.

Similarly as before we denote $\widetilde{x}_{j,k} = \phi(x_{j,k})$ for $j \in \{i_1, \cdots, i_m\}$, $\widetilde{u}_k = u_k \circ \phi^{-1}$, $\widetilde{\tau}_k = \tau_k \circ \phi^{-1}$, and $\widetilde{f}_k(x, \widetilde{u}_k(x)) = f(\phi^{-1}(x), u_k(\phi^{-1}(x)))$. Let $\varphi_k = \varphi_k^{(i)}$, $\Lambda_k = \Lambda_k^{(i)}$ and $N_k = N_k^{(i)}$ be as defined in (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4) respectively. The proof of Proposition 5.8 will be divided into several steps below.

Step 1. Blow-up analysis at the scale $o(\rho_k)$, where

$$\rho_k = \rho_k^{(i)} = \frac{1}{2} \inf_{j\in\{i_1,\cdots,i_m\}\setminus\{i\}} |\widetilde{x}_{j,k} - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}|.$$

By Proposition 3.1 we have $\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\Lambda_k(Lr_{i,k}) = 4\pi$. Let $r_k^{(1)} = r_{i,k}$. We distinguish the following two cases to proceed.

Case 1 *there exists some* $0 < \epsilon_0 < 1$ *such that for all* $t \in [r_k^{(1)}, \rho_k]$ *there holds* $\varphi_k(t) \geq \epsilon_0 \varphi_k(r_k^{(1)})$;

Case 2 *for any* $\epsilon > 0$ *there exists a minimal* $T_k = T_k(\epsilon) \in [r_k^{(1)}, \rho_k]$ *such that* $\varphi_k(T_k) = \epsilon\varphi_k(r_k^{(1)})$.

In Case 1, the decay estimate that we established in Lemma 5.2 remains valid on $[r_k^{(1)}, \rho_k]$. Moreover

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\Lambda_k(s_k) = 4\pi$$

for any sequence s_k satisfying $s_k/\rho_k \to 0$ and $s_k/r_k^{(1)} \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. The concentration analysis at scales up to $o(\rho_k)$ is complete.

In Case 2, as before we can find numbers $s_k^{(1)} < \rho_k$ with $\varphi_k(s_k^{(1)}) \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$, $\Lambda_k(s_k^{(1)}) \to 4\pi$ as $k \to \infty$, and $\varphi_k(s_k^{(1)})/\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(1)}) \to 0$ for any $L \geq 1$ as $k \to \infty$. We proceed by iteration up to some maximal index $\ell_0 \geq 1$ where either Case 1 or (5.40) holds with final radii $r_k^{(\ell_0)}$, $s_k^{(\ell_0)}$, respectively. Hence

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\Lambda_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}) = 4\pi\ell_0, \quad \lim_{k\to\infty}\varphi_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)})/\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(\ell_0)}) = 0, \ \forall L \geq 1 \tag{5.70}$$

and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}, t_k) = 0 \ \text{ for any sequence } \ t_k = o(\rho_k). \tag{5.71}$$

This leads to

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}, \rho_k/L) = 0. \tag{5.72}$$

For otherwise, we can find some $\mu_0 > 0$ such that up to a subsequence

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}, \rho_k) \geq \lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}, \rho_k/L) \geq \mu_0$$

for all $L \geq 1$. Take $t_k' \in (s_k^{(\ell_0)}, \rho_k)$ such that

$$0 < \lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}, t_k') < \frac{1}{2C_0}, \tag{5.73}$$

where C_0 is a constant as in Lemma 5.3. Then by Lemma 5.4 we have

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(s_k^{(\ell_0)}, t_k'/L) = 0.$$

In view of (5.71) and (5.73), there exists some $\nu_0 > 0$ such that up to a subsequence, $t_k' \geq \nu_0\rho_k$ for all k. This immediately implies (5.72) and completes Step 1.

To proceed, we introduce several terminologies concerning the classification of blow-up points near x_i^*. Define a set

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}^{(i)} = \{x_{i_1,k}, \cdots, x_{i_m,k}\},$$

where each $x_{j,k}$, $j \in \{i_1, \cdots, i_m\}$, denotes a sequence $(x_{j,k})$. In the sequel we do not distinguish sequences $(x_{j,k})$ and points $x_{j,k}$, the reader can easily recognize it from the context. Let $t_k > 0$ be a bounded sequence. For any $j \in \{i_1, \cdots, i_m\}$, we define a t_k-equivalent class associated with the sequence $x_{j,k}$ by

$$[x_{j,k}]_{t_k} := \left\{ x_{\ell,k} : d_g(x_{\ell,k}, x_{j,k}) = o(t_k),\ \ell \in \{i_1, \cdots, i_m\} \right\}.$$

The total number of sequences in $[x_{j,k}]_{t_k}$ is called the order of $[x_{j,k}]_{t_k}$. In particular, the order of $[x_{j,k}]_{\rho_k^{(j)}}$ is exactly one, while the order of $[x_{j,k}]_\delta$ is m. Actually we have $[x_{j,k}]_\delta = \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, if $x_{\ell,k} \in [x_{j,k}]_{t_k}$, then $x_{j,k} \in [x_{\ell,k}]_{t_k}$. Also, if $[x_{j,k}]_{t_k} \cap [x_{\ell,k}]_{t_k} \neq \emptyset$, then $[x_{j,k}]_{t_k} = [x_{\ell,k}]_{t_k}$. Hence every subset of $\mathcal{X}$ can be divided into several t_k-equivalent classes, any two of which have no intersection.

For any $1 \leq \ell < m$, we say that the property $(\mathscr{A}_\ell)$ holds for some t_k-equivalent class $[x_{j,k}]_{t_k}$ of order ℓ, if either (a) there exist $r_k > 0$ and integer $I^{(j)}$ such that for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and all $t \in [r_k, t_k]$ there holds $\varphi_k^{(j)}(t) \geq \epsilon_0 \varphi_k^{(j)}(r_k)$, $\Lambda_k^{(j)}(Lr_k) \to 4\pi I^{(j)}$ and $N_k^{(j)}(Lr_k, t_k/L) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ first, and then $L \to \infty$; or (b) there exist sequences $r_k < s_k < t_k$ and an integer $I^{(j)}$ such that $\varphi_k^{(j)}(s_k)/\varphi_k^{(j)}(Lr_k) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ for any $L \geq 1$, $\Lambda_k^{(j)}(t_k/L) \to 4\pi I^{(j)}$ and $N_k^{(j)}(s_k, t_k/L) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ first, and then $L \to \infty$. While we say that the property $(\mathscr{A}_m)$ holds, if there exits some $j \in \{i_1, \cdots, i_m\}$ and integer $I^{(j)}$ such that $\Lambda_k^{(j)}(\delta/L) \to 4\pi I^{(j)}$ as $k \to \infty$ first, and then $L \to \infty$.

According to Proposition 5.1, when $m = 1$, $(\mathscr{A}_1)$ holds. When $m > 1$, we let $\rho_{k,0} = \rho_k$ and $\rho_{k,j}$ $(1 \leq j \leq m-1)$ be as defined in (5.88) and (5.92) below. It follows from Step 1 that $(\mathscr{A}_1)$ holds for any t_k-equivalent class of order one, where

$$t_k \in \{\rho_{k,0}, \cdots, \rho_{k,m-1}\}. \tag{5.74}$$

Now we make induction on both orders of t_k-equivalent class and m. Suppose that for some integer $\nu \geq 1$, when $m = \nu$, the property $(\mathscr{A}_\nu)$ holds; while when $m > \nu$, the property $(\mathscr{A}_\ell)$ holds for any t_k-equivalent class of order $1 \leq \ell \leq \nu$, where t_k is as in (5.74). We shall prove the following: When $m = \nu + 1$, the property $(\mathscr{A}_{\nu+1})$ holds; When $m > \nu + 1$, the property $(\mathscr{A}_\ell)$ holds for any t_k-equivalent class of order $1 \leq \ell \leq \nu + 1$, where t_k is as in (5.74). Assuming this induction argument is complete, we conclude that $(\mathscr{A}_m)$ holds for any integer m. It is easy to see that (5.69) follows immediately from $(\mathscr{A}_m)$ and the fact that $u_k \to u_\infty$ in $C^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Sigma \setminus \{x_1^*, \cdots, x_i^*\})$.

In the next two steps, we shall prove that $(\mathscr{A}_m)$ holds for $m = \nu + 1$. In Step 4, we shall prove that $(\mathscr{A}_\ell)$ holds for any t_k-equivalent class of order $1 \leq \ell \leq \nu + 1$, where t_k is as in (5.74).

Step 2. Blow-up analysis at the scale ρ_k.

Let $m = \nu + 1$. Now we turn to carry out blow-up analysis at the scale ρ_k near $\widetilde{x}_{i,k}$. We first assume that for some $L \geq 1$ there exists some sequence (x_k) such that $\rho_k/L \leq R_k(x_k) \leq |x_k - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}| \leq L\rho_k$ and

$$|x_k - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}|^2 \widetilde{u}_k(x_k) \widetilde{f}_k(x_k, \widetilde{u}_k(x_k)) \geq \nu_0 > 0. \tag{5.75}$$

By Proposition 4.1 we may assume that $|x_k - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}| = \rho_k$. The following estimate is important for our subsequent analysis.

Lemma 5.9 *Assuming (5.75), we have $\varphi_k(\rho_k)/\varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)}) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.*

Proof. If we suppose that there exists some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\varphi_k(\rho_k) \geq \epsilon_0 \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})$, then we set

$$w_k(x) = \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})(\widetilde{u}_k(x) - \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Similar to Lemma 5.2, there holds for any $b < 2$

$$\overline{w}_k(r) \leq b \log \frac{r_k^{(\ell_0)}}{r} + C \tag{5.76}$$

for all $r \in [r_k^{(\ell_0)}, \rho_k]$. Let θ_k be as defined in (5.18). By (H5) and (*iii*) of Proposition 3.1, we find some uniform constant C such that

$$r_k^{(\ell_0)} \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)}) \theta_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)}) \leq C. \tag{5.77}$$

Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |x_k - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}|^2 u_k(x_k) \widetilde{f}_k(x_k, \widetilde{u}_k(x_k)) &\leq C\rho_k^2 \varphi_k(\rho_k)\theta_k(\rho_k) \\ &= C(r_k^{(\ell_0)})^2 \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})\theta_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)}) \left(\frac{\rho_k}{r_k^{(\ell_0)}} \right)^2 \frac{\varphi_k(\rho_k)}{\varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})} \frac{\theta_k(\rho_k)}{\theta_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})} \\ &\leq C \left(\rho_k / r_k^{(\ell_0)} \right)^2 e^{(1+o(1))(\varphi_k^2(\rho_k) - \varphi_k^2(r_k^{(\ell_0)}))} \\ &\leq C \left(\rho_k / r_k^{(\ell_0)} \right)^2 e^{(1+o(1))(1+\epsilon_0)\overline{w}_k(\rho_k)} \\ &\leq C \left(\rho_k / r_k^{(\ell_0)} \right)^{2-(1+o(1))(1+\epsilon_0)b} \to 0 \end{aligned} \tag{5.78}$$

as $k \to \infty$, if we choose $b < 2$ such that $(1 + \epsilon_0)b > 2$. Here the first inequality follows from Proposition 4.1, the second one follows from (H4), (H5) and (5.77), while the third one is a consequence of our assumption $\varphi_k(\rho_k) \geq \epsilon_0 \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})$, and the last one is implied by (5.76). The contradiction between (5.78) and (5.75) ends the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 5.9 implies that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $T_k \in [r_k^{(\ell_0)}, \rho_k]$ such that $\varphi_k(T_k) = \epsilon \varphi_k(r_k^{(\ell_0)})$. Hence at scales up to $o(\rho_k)$ we end with (5.40), where ℓ is replaced by ℓ_0. The desired quantization result at the scale ρ_k then is a consequence of the following result.

Lemma 5.10 *Assuming (5.75), then up to a subsequence we find some* $\alpha_0 \geq \nu_0$ *such that*

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} |x_k - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}|^2 \widetilde{u}_k(x_k) \widetilde{f}_k(x_k, \widetilde{u}_k(x_k)) = \alpha_0. \tag{5.79}$$

Moreover there exist a finite set $\mathcal{S}_\infty \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ *such that*

$$\eta_k(x) = \widetilde{u}_k(x_k)(\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x) - \widetilde{u}_k(x_k)) \to \eta(x) = \log \frac{2}{\sqrt{\alpha_0}(1 + |x|^2)}$$

in $C^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_\infty)$ *as* $k \to \infty$.

Proof. It is obvious that (5.79) holds for some $\alpha_0 \geq \nu_0 > 0$. Define

$$v_k(y) = \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k y)$$

for $y \in \Omega_k = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \widetilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k y \in \Omega\}$. Let

$$y_{j,k} = \frac{\widetilde{x}_{j,k} - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}}{\rho_k}$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_k = \mathcal{S}_k^{(i)} = \left\{ y_{j,k} : j = i_1, \cdots, i_{\nu+1} \right\}.$$

Without loss of generality we assume either $|y_{j,k}| \to \infty$ or $y_{j,k} \to y_j$, $j = i_1, \cdots, i_{\nu+1}$, and we let $\mathcal{S}_\infty = \mathcal{S}_\infty^{(i)}$ be the set of accumulation points of $\mathcal{S}_k$. Also we let

$$y_{0,k} = \frac{x_k - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}}{\rho_k}$$

be the scaled points of x_k for which (5.75) holds and which satisfy $|y_{0,k}| = 1$. Moreover we can assume $y_{0,k} \to y_0$ as $k \to \infty$.

Since $\widetilde{u}_k(x_k) \to \infty$ by (5.75) and $\mathcal{S}_\infty$ is a finite set, we have by using Proposition 4.1 and a standard covering argument that

$$v_k - \widetilde{u}_k(x_k) \to 0 \text{ locally uniformly on } \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_\infty \tag{5.80}$$

as $k \to \infty$. Using the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 5.6, we obtain

$$\eta_k \to \eta \quad \text{in} \quad C^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_\infty),$$

where $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_\infty)$ satisfies the equation

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2} \eta = \alpha_0 e^{2\eta} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_\infty.$$

It follows from (5.80) that $v_k/\widetilde{u}_k(x_k) \to 1$ locally uniformly on $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathcal{S}_\infty$. For any $L \geq 1$ we write

$$K_L = \mathbb{B}_L(0) \setminus (\cup_{y_j \in \mathcal{S}_\infty} \mathbb{B}_{\delta/L}(y_j)).$$

Combining (H4), (H5), (2.4) and (5.80), we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{2\eta} dx &\leq \lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{K_L} \frac{v_k(x)}{\widetilde{u}_k(x_k)} e^{(1+o(1))\eta_k (1+\frac{v_k(x)}{\widetilde{u}_k(x_k)})} dx \\
&= \lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{K_L} \frac{\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x) \widetilde{f}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x, \widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x))}{\widetilde{u}_k(x_k) \widetilde{f}_k(x_k, \widetilde{u}_k(x_k))} dx \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\nu_0} \limsup_{k\to\infty} \int_\Sigma u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g \leq \frac{C}{\nu_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $y_{j,k} \to y_j$ as $k \to \infty$, we can take sufficiently large L and k such that $\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j) \subset \mathbb{B}_{2/L}(y_{j,k})$ and $\mathbb{B}_{2/L}(y_{j,k}) \cap \mathbb{B}_{2/L}(y_{\alpha,k}) = \varnothing$ for any $\alpha \neq j$. Moreover let ℓ be the order of the ρ_k-equivalent class $[x_{j,k}]_{\rho_k}$. Clearly $\ell \leq \nu$. By our inductive assumption, $(\mathcal{A}_\ell)$ holds for $[x_{j,k}]_{\rho_k}$. Noting that Lemma 5.9 excludes the possibility of Case 1 with $r_k^{(1)}$ replaced by $r_k^{(\ell_0)}$, we can find sequences $r_k^{(j)} < s_k^{(j)}$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \varphi_k(s_k^{(j)})/\varphi_k(L r_k^{(j)}) = 0, \quad \forall L \geq 1. \tag{5.81}$$

and

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} N_k^{(j)}(s_k^{(j)}, \rho_k/L) = 0, \tag{5.82}$$

Note again that $y_{j,k} \to y_j$ as $k \to \infty$. There exists some constant C, which may depends on $|y_j|$ but not on k, such that $|\widetilde{x}_{j,k} - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}| \leq C\rho_k$. For any $x_{\alpha,k} \notin [x_{j,k}]_{\rho_k}$, we can take some large L_0 such that $|\widetilde{x}_{j,k} - \widetilde{x}_{\alpha,k}| \geq \rho_k/(2L_0)$ for all sufficiently large k. Recalling that $|x_k - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}| = \rho_k$ and applying Proposition 4.1, we obtain

$$\widetilde{u}_k(x_k) \leq \inf_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{2\rho_k/L_0}(\widetilde{x}_{j,k})} \widetilde{u}_k + C$$

for some uniform constant C. As in the proof of Lemma 5.2, we can find another uniform constant C such that for all $x \in \mathbb{B}_{2\rho_k/L_0}(\widetilde{x}_{j,k})$

$$\widetilde{u}_k(x) \geq \inf_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{2\rho_k/L_0}(\widetilde{x}_{j,k})} \widetilde{u}_k - C.$$

These two estimates immediately imply the existence of some uniform constant C such that

$$\widetilde{u}_k(x_k) \leq \widetilde{u}_k(x) + C \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{B}_{2\rho_k/L}(\widetilde{x}_{j,k}), \tag{5.83}$$

provided that $L \geq L_0$. Note that $g = e^{\psi}(dx^{1^2} + dx^{2^2})$ for some smooth function ψ with $\psi(0,0) = 0$. By the equation (1.2), we have for large L

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)} |\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta_k| dx &\leq \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)} \rho_k^2 \widetilde{u}_k(x_k)\, \widetilde{f}_k\left(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x, v_k(x)\right) e^{\psi(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+\rho_k x)} dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)} \rho_k^2 \widetilde{u}_k(x_k) \widetilde{\tau}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x) v_k(x) e^{\psi(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+\rho_k x)} dx \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2/L}(y_{j,k})} \rho_k^2 \widetilde{u}_k(x_k)\, \widetilde{f}_k\left(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x, v_k(x)\right) e^{\psi(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+\rho_k x)} dx \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2/L}(y_{j,k})} \rho_k^2 \widetilde{u}_k(x_k) \widetilde{\tau}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x) v_k(x) e^{\psi(\widetilde{x}_{i,k}+\rho_k x)} dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_{2\rho_k/L}(\widetilde{x}_{j,k})} \widetilde{u}_k(x_k) \left(\widetilde{f}_k(y, \widetilde{u}_k(y)) + \widetilde{\tau}_k(y) \widetilde{u}_k(y) \right) e^{\psi(y)} dy. \end{aligned}$$

With the help of (5.81)-(5.83) and an obvious analogy of (5.26), we obtain

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)} |\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta_k| dx = 0,$$

analogous to (5.59). In the same way of proving (5.65) we get

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)} \eta_k dx = 0.$$

In view of (5.83), we can find some uniform constant C such that for all $y \in \partial\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)$

$$\widetilde{u}_k(x_k)/\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{j,k} + \rho_k y) \leq C,$$

which together with Proposition 4.1 leads to

$$|y - y_{j,k}||\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta_k(y)| = |\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x - \widetilde{x}_{j,k}|\widetilde{u}_k(x_k)|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}\widetilde{u}_k(\widetilde{x}_{i,k} + \rho_k x)| \leq C.$$

This gives that

$$|\nabla_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta_k(y)| \leq \frac{C}{|y - y_j|}$$

for all $y \in \partial\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)$, provided that k is sufficiently large. Then we obtain the analogy of (5.68), namely, for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)}\varphi\partial_\nu\eta d\sigma = \lim_{L\to\infty}\int_{\partial\mathbb{B}_{1/L}(y_j)}\eta\partial_\nu\varphi d\sigma = 0.$$

This exclude y_j as a singular point of η as in Lemma 5.6. Since y_j is any point of $\mathcal{S}_\infty$, we conclude that η is a smooth solution to the equation

$$-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^2}\eta = \alpha_0 e^{2\eta} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2.$$

The remaining part of the conclusions of the lemma follows from a result of Chen-Li [5] immediately. ☐

Define a set

$$A_{L,k} = \{x \in \Omega : \rho_k/L \le R_k(x) \le |x - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}| \le L\rho_k\}. \tag{5.84}$$

It follows from Proposition 4.1 that $u_k(x)/\widetilde{u}_k(x_k) \to 1$ uniformly in $A_{L,k}$ as $k \to \infty$. Thus by Lemma 5.10, in case of (5.75) there holds

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{A_{L,k}}\widetilde{u}_k(x)\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k(x))dx &= \alpha_0\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{A_{L,k}}\frac{\widetilde{u}_k(x)\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k(x))}{\widetilde{u}_k(x_k)\widetilde{f}_k(x_k,\widetilde{u}_k(x_k))}dx\\ &= \alpha_0\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}e^{2\eta(x)}dx\\ &= \alpha_0\frac{4\pi}{\alpha_0} = 4\pi.\end{aligned} \tag{5.85}$$

Let

$$X_{k,1} = X_{k,1}^{(i)} = \{\widetilde{x}_{j,k} : \exists C > 0 \text{ such that } |\widetilde{x}_{j,k} - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}| \le C\rho_k \text{ for all } k\}. \tag{5.86}$$

We can divide $X_{k,1}$ into several ρ_k-equivalent classes with their orders no more than ν. Recalling our inductive assumption $(\mathcal{A}_\ell)$ with $1 \le \ell \le \nu$ and using (5.85), we can find some integer I such that

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\Lambda_k(L\rho_k) = 4\pi(1 + I).$$

On the other hand, if (5.75) does not hold, we have

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{A_{L,k}}\widetilde{u}_k\widetilde{f}_k(x,\widetilde{u}_k)dx = 0. \tag{5.87}$$

The energy estimate at the scale ρ_k again is finished.

Step 3. Blow-up analysis at scales exceeding ρ_k.

Now we deal with blow-up analysis at scales exceeding ρ_k near $\widetilde{x}_{i,k}$. Write

$$X_{k,0} = \{\widetilde{x}_{i_1,k}, \cdots, \widetilde{x}_{i_m,k}\}.$$

Recalling (5.86), we let

$$\rho_{k,1} = \rho_{k,1}^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \inf\limits_{\widetilde{x}_{j,k}\in X_{k,0}\setminus X_{k,1}} \frac{|\widetilde{x}_{j,k}-\widetilde{x}_{i,k}|}{2} & \text{if} \quad X_{k,0}\setminus X_{k,1} \ne \varnothing\\ \delta, & \text{if} \quad X_{k,0}\setminus X_{k,1} = \varnothing.\end{cases} \tag{5.88}$$

From this definition it follows that $\rho_{k,1}/\rho_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. Then, using the obvious analogy of Lemma 5.4, either we have

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} N_k(L\rho_k, \rho_{k,1}/L) = 0,$$

and we iterate to the next scale; or there exist a sequence t_k such that $t_k/\rho_k \to \infty$, $t_k/\rho_{k,1} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ and up to a subsequence such that

$$P_k(t_k) \geq \nu_0 > 0 \text{ for all large } k. \tag{5.89}$$

The argument then depends on whether (5.75) or (5.87) holds. In case of (5.75), as in Lemma 5.9, the bound (5.89) and Lemma 5.10 imply that $\varphi_k(t_k)/\varphi_k(\rho_k) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Then we can argue as in (5.40) for $r \in [L\rho_k, \rho_{k,1}/L]$ for sufficiently large L, and we can continue as before to resolve concentrations in this range of scales.

In case of (5.87) we further need to distinguish whether (5.40) or Case 1 holds at the final stage of our analysis at scales $o(\rho_k)$. Recalling that in case of (5.40) we have (5.70) and (5.72), in view of (5.87) for a suitable sequence of numbers $s_{k,1}^{(0)}$ such that $s_{k,1}^{(0)}/\rho_k \to \infty$, $t_k/s_{k,1}^{(0)} \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$ we obtain

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\left(\Lambda_k(s_{k,1}^{(0)}) - \sum_{\widetilde{x}_{j,k}\in\widetilde{X}_{k,1}} \Lambda_k^{(j)}(Lr_k^{(\ell_0^{(j)})})\right) = 0, \tag{5.90}$$

where $\Lambda_k^{(j)}(r)$ and $r_k^{(\ell_0^{(j)})}$ are computed as above with respect to the blow-up point $x_{j,k}$ and $\widetilde{X}_{k,1}$ is the modular set containing all t_k-equivalent classes of $X_{k,1}$, whence the distance between any two points of $\widetilde{X}_{k,1}$ is greater than $\widetilde{\nu}\rho_k$ for some constant $\widetilde{\nu} > 0$. In particular, with such a choice of $s_{k,1}^{(0)}$ we find the immediate quantization result

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\Lambda_k(s_{k,1}^{(0)}) = 4\pi I$$

for some positive integer I. Here again we use the inductive assumption that $(\mathscr{A}_l)$ holds for all ρ_k-equivalent classes of order ℓ with $1 \leq \ell \leq \nu$. While in Case 1 if we assume there is some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\varphi_k(s_{k,1}^{(0)}) \geq \epsilon_0\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(\ell_0^{(j)})}) \tag{5.91}$$

for all $r \in [Lr_k^{\ell_0^{(j)}}, s_{k,1}^{(0)}]$, then as before we have

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty} N_k^{(j)}(Lr_k^{(\ell_0^{(j)})}, s_{k,1}^{(0)}) = 0.$$

This contradicts (5.90) since $s_{k,1}^{(0)}/\rho_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$ and the modular set $\widetilde{X}_{k,1}$ has at least two elements. This implies that (5.91) does not hold and up to a subsequence there holds for any $L \geq 1$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{\varphi_k(s_{k,1}^{(0)})}{\varphi_k(Lr_k^{(\ell_0^{(j)})})} = 0$$

for all $x_{j,k} \in \widetilde{X}_{k,1}$ where Case 1 holds. Then we can continue to resolve concentrations on the range $[s_{k,1}^{(0)}, \rho_{k,1}/L]$ as before.

We then proceed by iteration. For $\ell \geq 2$ we inductively define the sets

$$X_{k,\ell} = X_{k,\ell}^{(i)} = \left\{\widetilde{x}_{j,k} : \exists C > 0 \text{ such that } |\widetilde{x}_{j,k} - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}| \leq C\rho_{k,\ell-1} \text{ for all } k\right\}$$

and let

$$\rho_{k,\ell} = \rho_{k,\ell}^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \inf\limits_{\widetilde{x}_{j,k} \in X_{k,0} \setminus X_{k,\ell}} \frac{|\widetilde{x}_{j,k} - \widetilde{x}_{i,k}|}{2} & \text{if} \quad X_{k,0} \setminus X_{k,\ell} \neq \varnothing \\ \delta, & \text{if} \quad X_{k,0} \setminus X_{k,\ell} = \varnothing. \end{cases} \tag{5.92}$$

Iteratively carrying out the above analysis at all scales $\rho_{k,\ell}$, exhausting all blow-up points $x_{j,k}$, up to a subsequence we obtain quantization result for $X_{k,0}$. Then Step 3 is finished.

It follows from Step 2 and Step 3 that there exists some integer I such that

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \Lambda_k(\delta/L) = 4\pi I, \tag{5.93}$$

analogous to Lemma 5.5. Here and in the sequel, I may denote different integer. Hence the property $(\mathcal{A}_m)$ holds when $m = \nu + 1$.

Step 4. $(\mathcal{A}_\ell)$ *holds for* $1 \leq \ell \leq \nu + 1$ *when* $m > \nu + 1$.

When $m > \nu + 1$, by our inductive assumption, $(\mathcal{A}_\ell)$ holds for all $1 \leq \ell \leq \nu$, it suffices to prove that $(\mathcal{A}_{\nu+1})$ holds for any t_k-equivalent class $[x_{j,k}]_{t_k}$ of order $\nu + 1$, where $j \in \{i_1, \cdots, i_m\}$ and t_k is as in (5.74). This is completely analogous to that $(\mathcal{A}_m)$ holds in the case of $m = \nu + 1$, which we proved above, except that (5.93) is replaced by

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \Lambda_k^{(j)}(t_k/L) = 4\pi I$$

for some integer I. We omit the details here. This ends Step 4. $\square$

Proposition 5.8 follows from the property $(\mathcal{A}_m)$ and the last assertion of Proposition 3.1.

6. Completion of the proof of Theorem 1.1.

In this section, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $x_{i,k} \to x_i^*$ as $k \to \infty$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, be as in Proposition 3.1. In view of possible complicated blow-up points, without loss of generality, we may assume for some $q \leq N$, $x_1^*, \cdots, x_q^*$ are different from each other and $x_\ell^* \in \{x_1^*, \cdots, x_q^*\}$ for any $q + 1 \leq \ell \leq N$. For any $1 \leq i \leq q$, we take an isothermal coordinate system $(U_i, \phi_i; \{x^1, x^2\})$ near x_i^* such that $\phi_i(x_i^*) = (0, 0)$ and $U_i = \phi_i^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_\delta(0))$, where δ is chosen sufficiently small such that $\overline{U_i}$ does not contain any x_j^* with $j \in \{1, \cdots, q\} \setminus \{i\}$. It follows from Propositions 5.1 and 5.8 that for some integer $I^{(i)}$ there holds

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\phi_i^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_{\delta/L}(0))} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g = 4\pi I^{(i)}.$$

By Proposition 3.1, $u_k \to u_\infty$ in $C^1_{\text{loc}}(\Sigma \setminus \{x_1^*, \cdots, x_q^*\})$ as $k \to \infty$. hence

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\Sigma \setminus \cup_{i=1}^q \phi_i^{-1}(\mathbb{B}_{\delta/L}(0))} u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g = \int_\Sigma u_\infty f_k(x, u_\infty) dv_g.$$

Combining these two estimates, we obtain

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Sigma u_k f_k(x, u_k) dv_g = \int_\Sigma u_\infty f_k(x, u_\infty) dv_g + 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^q I^{(i)}.$$

This together with (1.2) leads to

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_\Sigma(|\nabla_g u_k|^2+\tau_k u_k^2)dv_g=\int_\Sigma(|\nabla_g u_\infty|^2+\tau_\infty u_\infty^2)dv_g+4\pi\sum_{i=1}^q I^{(i)}.$$

In view of (2.2), or particularly (2.5), we then have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} J_k(u_k)=J_\infty(u_\infty)+4\pi\sum_{i=1}^q I^{(i)}.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

Acknowledgement. This work is supported by the NSFC 11171347.

References

[1] Adimurthi, O. Druet, Blow-up analysis in dimension 2 and a sharp form of Trudinger-Moser inequality, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 29 (2004) 295-322.

[2] Adimurthi, M. Struwe, Global compactness properties of semilinear elliptic equation with critical exponential growth, J. Functional Analysis 175 (2000) 125-167.

[3] Adimurthi, Y. Yang, Multibubble analysis on N-Laplace equation in $\mathbb{R}^N$, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 40 (2011) 1-14.

[4] T. Aubin, Nonlinear analysis on manifolds, Springer, 1982.

[5] W. Chen, C. Li, Classification of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations, Duke Math. J. 63 (1991) 615-622.

[6] O. Druet, Multibumps analysis in dimension 2: quantification of blow-up levels, Duke Math. J. 132 (2006) 217-269.

[7] L. Fontana, Sharp borderline Sobolev inequalities on compact Riemannian manifolds, Comm. Math. Helv. 68 (1993) 415-454.

[8] T. Lamm, F. Robert, M. Struwe, The heat flow with a critical exponential nonlinearity, J. Functional Analysis 257 (2009) 2951-2998.

[9] L. Martinazzi, A threshold phenomenon for embeddings of H_0^m into Orlicz spaces, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 36 (2009) 493-506.

[10] L. Martinazzi, M. Struwe, Quantization for an elliptic equation of order $2m$ with critical exponential non-linearity, Math Z. 270 (2012) 453-486.

[11] J. Moser, A sharp form of an inequality by N.Trudinger, Ind. Univ. Math. J. 20 (1971) 1077-1091.

[12] S. Pohozaev, The Sobolev embedding in the special case $pl=n$, Proceedings of the technical scientific conference on advances of scientific reseach 1964-1965, Mathematics sections, 158-170, Moscov. Energet. Inst., Moscow, 1965.

[13] M. Struwe, Quantization for a fourth order equation with critical exponential growth, Math. Z. 256 (2007) 397-424.

[14] N. Trudinger, On embeddings into Orlicz spaces and some applications, J. Math. Mech. 17 (1967) 473-484.

[15] H. Wu, C. Shen, Y. Yu, Introduction to Riemannian geometry, Peking University Press, 1981.

[16] Y. Yang, L. Zhao, A class of Adams-Fontana type inequalities and related functionals on manifolds, Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl. 17 (2010) 119-135.